THEOSOPHY

A MAGAZINE DEVOTED TO

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, AND THE BROTHERHOOD OF HUMANITY

THE STUDY OF OCCULT SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY, AND ARYAN LITERATURE

Vol. XLV—No. 4 **February, 1957**

THE Secret Doctrine teaches no Atheism, except in the Hindu sense of the word nastika, or the rejection of idols, including every anthropomorphic god. In this sense every Occultist is a Nastika.

It admits a Logos or a collective "Creator" of the Universe; a Demi-urgos—in the sense implied when one speaks of an "Architect" as the "Creator" of an edifice, whereas that Architect has never touched one stone of it, but, while furnishing the plan, left all the manual labour to the masons; in our case the plan was furnished by the Ideation of the Universe, and the constructive labour was left to the Hosts of intelligent Powers and Forces.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY

CONTENTS

MEMORIAL DAYS 145
NOTES ON THE DHAMMAPADA 148
THE ROOTS OF RITUALISM IN CHURCH AND MASONRY 152
PERSPECTIVE ON THE BIBLE 170
THE MAGIC POTENCY 174
TO SPEAK CAREFULLY 176
YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK—AND ANSWER 177
MORALITY VERSUS RITUALISM 180
ON THE LOOKOUT 183

$3.50 per Annum *35 Cents per Copy*

Edited and Published by

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY

245 West 33rd Street, Los Angeles 7, California, U. S. A.

Publisher's Announcements

THEOSOPHY: Established November, 1912, by Robert Crosbie. Published monthly by The Theosophy Company, at Los Angeles, California, U. S. A. This Magazine is edited independently of any theosophical society or other organization. The Publishers assume full responsibility for all unsigned articles herein.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: No subscriptions are accepted for less than one year of 12 numbers, but subscriptions may begin with any desired number. All subscriptions, orders for single back numbers, and back volumes, bound or unbound, should be accompanied by the necessary remittance. Price $3.50 per annum; single numbers of the current volume, 35 cents each; back numbers, 50 cents each; back volumes, unbound, $5.00 each; for library style binding, prices on request. *Volumes I and XII are out of print.*

COMMUNICATIONS: Contributions submitted for publication should be typewritten double-spaced on one side of the paper only, with wide margins, and copies should be in all cases retained by the writers, as no manuscripts are returned.

CORRESPONDENCE: Letters from subscribers and readers are welcomed, with criticisms, comments or questions on any subject treated in the magazine. Questions on Theosophical Philosophy and History will be replied to direct, or, if of sufficient general interest, in the pages of the Magazine.

BEQUESTS AND DONATIONS: Gifts and legacies will be gladly received from those in sympathy with the objects of this Magazine when such benefactions are unencumbered and unrestricted. Donors should make their gifts to

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY, of Los Angeles, California, U. S. A., which is an incorporated association, legally empowered to receive such donations and bequests in furtherance of its objects. These objects are:

(*a*) To form the nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste, or color;

(*b*) The study of ancient and modern religions, philosophies and sciences, and the demonstration of the importance of such study; and

(*c*) The investigation of the unexplained laws of Nature and the psychical powers latent in man.

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY
245 West 33rd Street
Los Angeles 7, California, U. S. A.

LIBRARY COPY

THE UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS,
[illegible]
[illegible] Rao Road,
BANGALORE, South India.

A U M

The Secret Doctrine is the accumulated wisdom of the ages.
—H. P. BLAVATSKY

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XLV February, 1957 No. 4

MEMORIAL DAYS

FEBRUARY is a month of national holidays in the United States —a time when the people of this country habitually remind themselves of the greatness of their origins and the struggles which have wracked this continent in the name of freedom and equality. Holidays of this sort—in fact, every sort of notable anniversary—have a value in that they give the mind a focus for reflection, a "seed," one might say, for meditation.

About the only people of whom it might be said that they have no need of turning their minds to the memorable men of past American history would be the men themselves who are remembered in February —the men who *made* the holidays. They, wherever they are, do not require the inspiration of the past, since it is they who made the past so memorable. Their birthdays, for the rest of us, are occasions for recalling a steadfastness in ideal and practice which knew no seasons and acknowledged no peaks of achievement. Washington and Lincoln were Washington and Lincoln throughout the year.

So it is with these and other cycles which bear a meaning to aspiring men. The time will come when the notability of the cycle will pass, as its dream of high endeavor is dissolved by the constancy of daily practice. Ultimately, all cycles will pass away, absorbed in the absolute night—or day—of Paranirvana. For then the differences in perception, which create the cycles of existence, will all be united in one universal perception, and the events which spring from individual perceptions and cognitions, will be lost in the unchanging reality of being—or non-being. Only that which suffers and enjoys cycles, but remains unaffected by them, will continue to be.

It is a curious thing, albeit a natural one, that we are obliged to make the opposite of constancy, a periodic point in the cycle which returns but once a year, do service to remind us of men of constancy. It is curious to reflect, also, that were it not for such cycles, we could not think of such men at all; indeed, we could not *think.* Perhaps, by a parallel process, it follows that in all movements of the mind toward high and noble things, we are constrained by the very nature of thought to define and identify the objects of our reflections in the terms of their opposites; so that, for this reason, the substance of their being forever escapes our straining intellects until, by a kind of alchemy, or mental *judo,* we concede the futility of our exercises and thus achieve the prize.

"The mind," it is said, "is the great Slayer of the Real. Let the Disciple slay the Slayer." But what is this slaying that must take place? Surely, it is not to abandon the use of the mind, without which we could not even *mis*conceive the ideal, but to comprehend the limit of the intellectual process. As *The Secret Doctrine* puts it:

> The Ego, progressing in an arc of ascending subjectivity, must exhaust the experience of every plane. But not till the Unit is merged in the ALL, whether on this or any other plane, and Subject and Object alike vanish in the absolute negation of the Nirvanic State (negation, again, only *from our plane*), is scaled that peak of Omniscience—the Knowledge of things-in-themselves; and the solution of the yet more awful riddle approached, before which even the highest Dhyan Chohan must bow in silence and ignorance—the unspeakable mystery of that which is called by the Vedantins, the PARABRAHMAM.

To overcome the mind, to use it as a tool, and not to be used by it—this is to "exhaust the experience" of the plane on which the mind is the ultimate reality, the plane of causes and of differentiation. To press the mind to the limit of conception—this is the discipline provided by the Three Fundamental Propositions of the Secret Doctrine. To reach beyond—this is the subject-matter of Patanjali's Yoga Aphorisms.

How, then, does the mind "slay the real"? It does it through the delusion of Nama-rupa, name-and-form. No one is more susceptible to this class of delusion than the student of Theosophy. For here, in intellectual terms, are spread out all the great categories of existence, evolution, and experience. The currency of the Theosophical books is an intellectual currency. Yet if the whole world had verbal acquaintance with the contents of those books, would, then, the whole world "know"

Theosophy? It is a question. For daily the student learns to his sorrow the difference between words and wisdom, between metaphysical structures and the orientation he longs for among the planes and states of life and consciousness.

The adept, it is said, is known by the number of principles he has under his control. It is control that makes him an *occultist.* A Theosophist, it might be said, is known by the clarity with which he understands his own motives and the wisdom he applies in governing his life. But since every man lives his life of motive and applies his wisdom "in secret," no one can really know or measure the Theosophical degree of another, nor, is it important to do so.

But the practical problem, for every one of us, lies in the mastery of cycles. Slowly, we outgrow the periodicities of nature. As beings of mind, we carry our own light about with us, and so become independent of day and night. In sundry ways, we achieve independence of other natural cycles and alternations. We set ourselves free from the wheel, in order, if we are wise, to suffer as little interruption as possible in the work we have chosen to do. So with the cycles known as holidays. For children, Christmas is a time of objective delight—that, at any rate, is what we have made of Christmas for children, and there is surely nothing wrong with the glee that Christmas brings them. As people grow up, Christmas becomes an increasingly subjective occasion, or ought to. There is a kind of childishness in the elaborate gifts adults give to one another "for Christmas"—in practical admission that they are unable to fulfill the cycle in subjective terms, and must offer gifts as a substitute.

The national holidays ought to arouse their own kind of maturity among the best minds of the age, and, to some extent, they do. It will be a long time, however, before we have absorbed the vision of Washington and Lincoln and turned what they saw and hoped for into the substance of our national being. Instead, there is great speechifying on their birthdays, recalling the heroism of an age that is past, instead of a sober wondering about what heroism they would practice in our own time.

The holidays, therefore, remain for all too many merely "profane" cycles of external celebration, instead of a time for searching into the highest meanings of our national life. It is fortunate for us that such beings do not live "only once."

NOTES ON THE DHAMMAPADA

A SHORT, three-page chapter, in discussion of anger, illustrates Buddha's broad perspective regarding all matters of good and evil. Canto 17, in its eighth verse, is both wise counsel and reminder of all the subtle emphases of the philosophy of Karma:

> There never was, nor will be, nor is there now to be found any one who stands wholly praised or utterly condemned.

This single sentence aids the student to realize that *anyone* may become a Buddha, but that no one can be *made* to become one—or even to become a "good man." Condemnation and blame of any human being is born from ignorance of the intricacies of karmic law, and is also a tragic waste of energy—energy which the disciple should put to constructive use. Yet in our present human state how much of everyone's life is involved with the casting and receiving of blame! Even Gotama, in his time, was criticized by many, and from many points of view. So Buddha, in buttressing the folly of praise or condemnation, remarks the wisdom of a traditional counsel provided by wise men:

> This is an old saying, O Atula; it is not of this day only. "They blame him who sits silent, they blame him who talks much, they blame him who speaks moderately in measured terms." There is not any one in the world who is not blamed.

What course is one to take in the presence of apparent evil or injustice? How counteract the efforts of men who prey on their fellows, who provide poor examples, or who incite to violence? Buddha's reply is as simple as it is unequivocal:

> Let a man overcome anger by gentleness; let him overcome evil by good; let him overcome the niggard by liberality; let him overcome the liar by truth.
>
> Speak the truth; yield not to anger; if asked give even a little. By these three steps a man reaches the presence of the gods.
>
> The sages who injure none, and who always control their body attain the changeless state; therein is no grief.

A current Buddhist publication, *The Light of Buddha,* issued by the Burma Buddhist Society at Mandalay, contains in its April issue evidence that the profound doctrine of "non-violence" has never died in Buddhist lands. Dr. R. L. Soni, Director of the World Institute of Buddhist Culture in Mandalay, writes:

A person is not what he or she barely seems: there is a depth in personality which only a Buddha can discern in totality. As only a fraction of a person can be seen at a time, it wouldn't be correct to assess the entire personality on the basis of the presenting part. This, because a part in the case of a personality is not the mathematical average of the whole. Who knows, the next presenting section of the same person may be just a reversal of what he or she appeared earlier! This reversal "may" be automatic under the stress of the pent-up inherent Kamma-vipaka (resultant of past actions) or the process may be accelerated or the desirable result precipitated under the personal influence of some saint.

The working of the Law of Karma, though strictly under the operation of the facts of "Cause and Effect," is nevertheless very intricate and complex, as it covers the entire past of the person; the resultants of the past actions are in various combinations, most of which are incessantly permutating into new groupings. Thus every person in reality is a very deep phenomenon. We can assess him only skin-deep or a little beyond that limit. Therefore it behoves us not to be led or misled by mere appearances: it becomes us to have Karuna (Sympathy) and Metta (Lovingkindness) towards all.

As a matter of fact, every living being is potentially a "candidate" for Nibbana. Those who seem to be on the Wrong Path today, may be led through sufferings consequent to their evils, to the Right Path in due course. Buddhism holds out the "Banner of Hope" for all. The Right Road to Nibbana is open to all: it is closed to none. This spells the message of Universal Fellowship.

In this series we have previously discussed the manner in which the doctrine of non-interference carries over in even the simplest Buddhist societies of our own day, and another quotation is here apropos: Norman Lewis' *A Dragon Apparent* (Scribner, 1951), describes the prevailing attitude of mind among the Laotians of Indo-China:

> In Laos there is no social insurance and there are no poor. The old and the sick are supported by the young, or, where they are left without able-bodied providers, by the community, and the bonzes give instructions for the necessary land to be placed under cultivation for them. The accumulation of wealth which is not to be used for definite, approved purposes, causes a man to lose prestige among his neighbours, just, as in the West, the process is reversed. The main difference, it seems, between Buddhism in Indo-China, and Christianity —apart from any question as to their relative merits—is that, whether we admire it or not, the former is largely put into practice. It is a stimulating reflection that the Western millionaire, obsessed for the sake of social distinction with the amassing of enormous possessions —little of which he can personally consume—would attain the same

ends of personal celebrity under a Laotian Buddhistic order of things by austerities—by embracing the most abject and prestige-conferring form of poverty. . . . In the matter of converts the Evangelists have been no more unsuccessful than their Portuguese, Spanish and French forerunners. The Laotians cannot follow the subtlety of Western religious concepts. They have a passion for taking things *au pied de la lettre.* Being told that the basic commandment of Buddhism is "thou shalt not kill," they cannot swallow such reservations as capital punishment and "the just war;" while casuistry repels them.

This same point of view is represented by present followers of Zen tradition: Just as one is first tempted to condemn a *person* because of acts or appearances which are not approved, so does one tend to judge philosophical ideas and perceptions according to the personages with whom they are associated. And the Zen disciple is reminded that he must transcend this limitation of vision—adopt the true theosophical point of view that the truth of a statement, or the truths embodied in either scripture or contemporary work, neither gain nor lose because of the apparent characteristics of their authors. Psychiatrist Hubert Benoit, in his summation of the psychology of Zen, discusses both our temptation to form over-simplified value judgments and the fact that in the culmination of Zen discipline, this tendency is completely eliminated:

Preoccupations concerning the individual who has conceived a doctrinal exposition are in relation with our illusory need to find the Absolute in an aspect of the multiple. We wish to find the Absolute incarnated in a form. When we read a text expressing an ensemble of ideas we are tempted to adhere to it as a whole or to reject it altogether; that should be easier and should save us the personal trouble of reflection. From that moment we are led necessarily to envisage the author of the text as an entity whose individual value intrigues us: does he deserve our respect or our disdain? This way of reading, sound if a documentary text is in question, is no longer suitable when we wish to form our thought and discover our truth (that is, our own intellectual view of Reality). When I seek for my truth I know that I shall not find it outside myself; what is outside me—which I am going to use in order to find the truth in myself—can appear as a coherent whole; but I must not let myself be impressed by this appearance, otherwise I shall never succeed in effecting the analytical process which thereafter conditions my personal synthesis, my intellectual assimilation.

The adhesion given by the reader to such and such a thought expressed in a book should not depend upon the fact that this thought has been conceived by such and such a man or by such and such an-

> other, but upon that inner resonance that we must learn to recognise and to use as our only guide.

Obviously, the Buddhist doctrine of non-interference is not intended to lead away from discrimination, or to provide escape by way of a *tamasic* indifference. The aim is the development of "inner resonance," and that "inner resonance" makes it possible for the disciple to serve his fellows *without* interfering with their own intricate lines of karmic development and travail. Formalities of judgment are not to be *suspended,* but done away with altogether; our need for truth is so deep and so constant that we are indeed fools to miss the opportunity of discerning it wherever it appears.

"A Sermon of the Buddha," recently published in the Bombay *Aryan Path,* provides a homely but effective analogy—which becomes the more impressive when one realizes that each form of ignorance is, indeed, "a poisoned arrow." The Accomplished One, Gotama, once said that allowing ourselves to form judgments on the basis of external evidence is to attempt to dictate the terms of our own illumination:

> It is as if a man had been wounded by an arrow thickly smeared with poison, and his friends and companions, his relatives and kinsfolk, were to procure for him a physician or surgeon; and the sick man were to say, "I will not have this arrow taken out until I have learnt whether the man who wounded me belonged to the warrior caste, or to the Brahmin caste, or to the agricultural caste, or to the menial caste!"

At first glance, this Buddhist outlook may seem a counsel of perfection, but on reflection it appears as the most practical of all practical counsels, provided the aim is genuinely that of attaining sympathetic and wise understanding. And just as immediately relevant are Buddha's suggestions to his disciples, as he points out that the first step is to be "watchful of speech-irritation." In the next verse of Chapter 17, Buddha admonishes his disciples to "be watchful of mind-irritation," but says it is carelessness and callowness of *speech* which must be initially guarded against. For every man, every day, is tempted to *say* those things which reflect his bias and ignorance whenever his personal opinion seems threatened by the words of another. Buddha is, in other words, providing a fundamental treatise on "gossip" when he suggests that to "practice virtue with speech" means, first of all, a relinquishing of the habit of criticizing in negative terms.

THE ROOTS OF RITUALISM IN CHURCH AND MASONRY

I

THEOSOPHISTS are very often, and very unjustly too, accused of infidelity and even of Atheism. This is a grave error, especially with regard to the latter charge.

In a large society, composed of so many races and nationalities, in an association wherein every man and woman is left to believe in whatever he or she likes, and to follow or not to follow—just as they please—the religion they were born and brought up in, there is but little room left for Atheism. As for "infidelity," it becomes a misnomer and a fallacy. To show how absurd is the charge, in any case, it is sufficient to ask our traducers to point out to us, in the whole civilized world, that person who is *not* regarded as an "infidel" by some other person belonging to some different creed. Whether one moves in highly respectable and orthodox circles, or in a so-called heterodox "society," it is all the same. It is a mutual accusation, tacitly, if not openly, expressed; a kind of a mental game at shuttlecock and battledore flung reciprocally, and in polite silence, at each other's heads. In sober reality, then, no theosophist any more than a non-theosophist can be an infidel; while, on the other hand, there is no human being living who is not an infidel in the opinion of some sectarian or other. As to the charge of Atheism, it is quite another question.

What is *Atheism,* we ask, first of all? Is it disbelief in and denial of the existence of a God, or Gods, or simply the refusal to accept a personal deity on the somewhat gushy definition of R. Hall, who explains Atheism as "a ferocious system" because, "it leaves nothing *above* (?) us to awe, nor around us to awaken tenderness" (!) If the former, then most of our members—the hosts in India, Burmah, and elsewhere—would demur, as they believe in Gods and supernal beings, and are in great *awe* of some of them. Nor would a number of Western Theosophists fail to confess their full belief in Spirits, whether spatial or planetary, ghosts or angels. Many of us accept the existence of high and low Intelligences, and of Beings as great as any "personal" God. This is no occult secret. What we confessed to in the November

---

NOTE.—This article by H. P. Blavatsky was first published in *Lucifer* for March, 1889, and was reprinted in THEOSOPHY for May, 1916.

LUCIFER (editorial), we reiterate again. Most of us believe in the survival of the Spiritual Ego, in Planetary Spirits and *Nirmanakayas,* those great Adepts of the past ages, who, renouncing their right to Nirvana, remain in our spheres of being, not as "spirits" but as complete spiritual human Beings. Save their corporeal, visible envelope, which they leave behind, they remain as they were, in order to help poor humanity, as far as can be done without sinning against Karmic law. This is the "Great Renunciation," indeed; an incessant, conscious self-sacrifice throughout æons and ages till that day when the eyes of blind mankind will open and, instead of the few, *all* will see the universal truth. These Beings may well be regarded as God and Gods—if they would but allow the fire in our hearts, at the thought of that purest of all sacrifices, to be fanned into the flame of adoration, or the smallest altar in their honour. But they will not. Verily, "the secret heart is fair Devotion's (only) temple," and any other, in this case, would be no better than profane ostentation.

Now with regard to other invisible Beings, some of whom are still higher, and others far lower on the scale of divine evolution. To the latter we will have nothing to say; the former will have nothing to say to us: for we are as good as non-existent for them. The homogeneous can take no cognizance of the heterogeneous; and unless we learn to shuffle off our mortal coil and commune with them "spirit to spirit," we can hardly hope to recognise their true nature. Moreover, every true Theosophist holds that the divine HIGHER SELF of every mortal man is of the same essence as the essence of these Gods. Being, moreover, endowed with free-will, hence having, more than they, responsibility, we regard the incarnated EGO as far superior to, if not more divine than, any spiritual INTELLIGENCE *still awaiting incarnation.* Philosophically, the reason for this is obvious, and every metaphysician of the Eastern school will understand it. The incarnated EGO has odds against it which do not exist in the case of a pure divine Essence unconnected with matter; the latter has no personal merit, whereas the former is on his way to final perfection through the trials of existence, of pain and suffering. The shadow of Karma does not fall upon that which is divine and unalloyed, and so different from us that no relation can exist between the two. As to those deities which are regarded in the Hindu esoteric Pantheon as finite and therefore under the sway of Karma, no true philosopher would ever worship them; they are signs and symbols.

Shall we then be regarded as atheists, only because while believing in Spiritual Hosts—those beings who have come to be worshipped in their collectivity as a *personal* God—we reject them absolutely as representing the ONE Unknown? and because we affirm that the eternal Principle, the ALL in ALL, or the *Absoluteness* of the *Totality,* cannot be expressed by limited words, nor be symbolised by anything with conditioned and qualificative attributes? Shall we, moreover, permit to pass without protest the charge against us of idolatry—by the Roman Catholics, of all men? They, whose religion is as pagan as any of the solar and element worshippers; whose creed was framed out for them, cut and dry, ages before the year I of Christian era; and whose dogmas and rites are the same as those of every *idolatrous* nation—if any such nation still exists in spirit anywhere at this day. Over the whole face of the earth, from the North to the South Pole, from the frozen gulfs of Northland to the torrid planes of Southern India, from Central America to Greece and Chaldea, the Solar Fire, as the symbol of divine Creative Power, of Life and Love, was worshipped. The union of the Sun (male element) with Earth and the Water (matter, the female element) was celebrated in the temples of the whole Universe. If Pagans had a feast commemorative of this union—which they celebrated nine months ere the Winter Solstice, when Isis was said to have conceived—so have the Roman Catholic Christians. The great and *holy day* of the *Annunciation,* the day on which the Virgin Mary "found favour with (her) God" and conceived "the Son of the *Highest,*" is kept by Christians *nine months before Christmas.* Hence, the worship of the Fire, lights and lamps in the churches. Why? Because Vulcan, the fire-God, married Venus, the daughter of the Sea; that the Magi watched over the sacred fire in the East, and the Virgin-Vestals in the West. The Sun was the "Father," Nature, the eternal Virgin-Mother: Osiris and Isis, Spirit-Matter, the latter worshipped under each of its three states by Pagan and Christian. Hence the Virgins—even in Japan—clothed with star-spangled blue, standing on the lunar crescent, as symbolical of female Nature (in her three elements of Air, Water, Earth); Fire or the male Sun, fecundating her yearly with his radiant beams (the "cloven tongues like as of fire" of the Holy Ghost).

In *Kalevala* the oldest epic Poem of the Finns, of the pre-Christian antiquity of which there remains no doubt in the minds of scholars, we read of the gods of Finland, the gods of air and water, of fire and the forest, of Heaven and the Earth. In the superb translation by J. M.

Crawford, in Rune L (Vol. II) the reader will find the whole legend of the Virgin Mary in

> *Mariatta,* child of beauty,
> Virgin-Mother of the Northland . . .

Ukko, the great Spirit, whose abode is in Yumala, the sky or Heaven, chooses the Virgin Mariatta as his vehicle to incarnate through her in a Man-God. She becomes pregnant by plucking and eating a red berry (*marja*), when, repudiated by her parents, she gives birth to a "Son immortal," in the *manger of a stable.* Then the "Holy Babe" disappears, and Mariatta is in search of him. She asks a star, "the guiding star of Northland," where her "holy baby lies hidden," but the star answers her angrily:

> If I knew, I would not tell thee;
> 'Tis thy child that me created,
> In the cold to shine for ever. . . .

and tells the Virgin nothing. Nor will the golden moon help her, because, Mariatta's babe having created her, left her in the great sky:

> Here to wander in the darkness,
> All alone at eve to wander,
> Shining for the good of others. . . .

It is only the "Silver Sun" who, taking pity upon the Virgin-Mother, tells her:

> Yonder is thy golden infant,
> There thy holy babe lies sleeping,
> Hidden to his belt in water,
> Hidden in the reeds and rushes.

She takes the holy baby home, and while the mother calls him "Flower,"

> Others named him *Son of Sorrow.*

Is this a post-Christian legend? Not at all; for, as said, it is *essentially pagan in origin* and recognized as pre-Christian. Hence, with such data in hand in literature, the ever-recurring taunts of idolatry and atheism, of infidelity and paganism, ought to cease. The term *idolatry,* moreover, is of Christian origin. It was used by the early Nazarenes, during the 2½ centuries of our era, against those nations who used temples and churches, statues and images, because they, the

early Christians themselves, *had neither temples, statues, nor images,* all of which they abhorred. Therefore the term "idolatrous" fits far better our accusers than ourselves, as this article will show. With Madonnas on every cross road, their thousands of statues, from Christs and Angels in every shape down to Popes and Saints, it is rather a dangerous thing for a Catholic to taunt any Hindu or Buddhist with idolatry. The assertion has now to be proved.

II

We may begin by the origin of the word God. What is the real and primitive meaning of the term? Its meanings and etymologies are as many as they are various. One of them shows the word derived from an old Persion and mystic term *goda.* It means "itself," or something self-emanating from the absolute Principle. The root word was *godan* —whence Wodan, Woden, and Odin, the Oriental radical having been left almost unaltered by the Germanic races. Thus they made of it *gott,* from which the adjective *gut*—"good," as also the term *gotz,* or idol, were derived. In ancient Greece, the word Zeus and *Theos* led to the Latin *Deus.* This *goda,* the emanation, is not, and cannot be, identical with that from which it radiates, and is, therefore, but a periodical, finite manifestation. Old Aratus, who wrote "full of Zeus are all the streets and the markets of man; full of Him is the sea and the harbours," did not limit his deity to such a temporary reflection on our terrestrial plane as Zeus, or even its antetype—Dyaus, but meant, indeed, the universal, omnipresent Principle. Before the radiant god *Dyaus* (the sky) attracted the notice of man, there was the Vedic *Tad* ("that") which, to the Initiate and philosopher, would have no definite name, and which was the absolute Darkness that underlies every manifested radiancy. No more than the mythical Jupiter—the later reflection of Zeus—could Surya, the Sun, the first manifestation in the world of Maya and the Son of Dyaus, fail to be termed "Father" by the ignorant. Thus the Sun became very soon interchangeable and one with Dyaus; for some, the "Son," for others, the "Father" in the radiant sky; *Dyaus-Pitar,* the Father in the Son, and the Son in the Father, truly shows however, his finite origin by having the Earth assigned to him as a wife. It is during the full decadence of metaphysical philosophy that *Dyava-prithivi* "Heaven and Earth" began to be represented as the Universal cosmic parents, not alone of men, but of the gods also. From the original conception, abstract and poetical, the ideal cause fell into

grossness. Dyaus, the sky, became very soon Dyaus or Heaven, the abode of the "Father," and finally, indeed, that Father himself. Then the Sun, upon being made the symbol of the latter, received the title of *Dina-Kara* "day-maker," of *Bhaskara* "light-maker," now the Father of his Son, and *vice versa.* The reign of ritualism and of anthropomorphic cults was henceforth established and finally degraded the whole world, retaining supremacy to the present civilized age.

Such being the common origin, we have but to contrast the two deities—the god of the Gentiles and the god of the Jews—on their own *revealed* WORD; and judging them on their respective definitions of themselves, conclude intuitively which is the nearest to the grandest ideal. We quote Colonel Ingersoll, who brings Jehovah and Brahma parallel with each other. The former, "from the clouds and darkness of Sinai," said to the Jews:

> "Thou shalt have no other gods before me. . . . Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them nor serve them; for I, the Lord thy God, am a jealous God, *visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them* that hate me." Contrast this with the words put by the Hindu into the mouth of Brahm: "I am the same to all mankind. They who honestly serve other gods, involuntarily worship me. I am he who partaketh of all worship, and I am the reward of all worshippers." Compare these passages. The first, a dungeon where crawl the things begot of jealous slime; the other, great as the domed firmament inlaid with suns. . . .

The "first" is the god who haunted Calvin's fancy, when he added to his doctrine of predestination that of Hell being paved with the skulls of *unbaptized* infants. The beliefs and dogmas of our churches are far more blasphemous in the ideas they imply than those of the *benighted* Heathen. The *amours* of Brahma, under the form of a buck, with his own daughter, as a deer, or of Jupiter with Leda, under that of a swan, are grand *allegories.* They were never given out as a *revelation,* but known to have been the products of the poetic fancy of Hesiod and other mythologists. Can we say as much of the *immaculate daughters* of the god of the Roman Catholic Church—Anna and Mary? Yet, even to breathe that the Gospel narratives are allegories too, as they would be most sacrilegious were they accepted in their dead letter, constitutes in a Christian born the *acme* of blasphemy!

Verily, they may whitewash and mask as much as they like the god of Abraham and Isaac, they shall never be able to disprove the assertion of Marcion, who denied that the God of *Hate* could be the same as the

"Father of Jesus." Heresy or not, but the "Father in Heaven" of the Churches remained since then a hybrid creature; a mixture between the Jove of the Pagan mobs and the "jealous God" of Moses, exoterically the SUN, whose abode is in Heaven, or the sky, esoterically. Does he not give birth to LIGHT "that shineth in Darkness," to the Day, the bright Dyaus, the Son, and is he not the MOST HIGH—*Deus Cœlum?* And is it not again *Terra,* the "Earth," the ever immaculate as the ever prolific Virgin who, fecundated by the ardent embraces of her "Lord" —the fructifying rays of the Sun, becomes, in this terrestrial sphere, the mother of all that lives and breathes on her vast bosom? Hence, the sacredness of her products in Ritualism—the *bread* and the *wine.* Hence also, the ancient *messis,* the great sacrifice to the goddess of harvest (*Ceres Eleusina,* the Earth again): messis, for the Initiates, *missa* for the profane,[1] now transformed into the Christian mass or liturgy. The ancient oblation of the fruits of the Earth to the Sun, the *Deus Aitissimus,* "the Most High," the symbol of the G.A.O.T.U. of the Masons to this day, became the foundation of the most important ritual among the ceremonies of the new religion. The worship offered to Osiris-Isis (the Sun and the Earth),[2] to Bel and the cruciform Astarte of the Babylonians; to Odin or Thor and Friga, of the Scandinavians; to Belen and the *Virgo Paritura* of the Celts; to Apollo and the *Magna Mater* of the Greeks; all these couples having the same meaning, passed bodily to, and were transformed by, the Christians into the Lord God or the Holy Ghost descending upon the Virgin Mary.

Deus Sol or *Solus,* the Father, was made interchangeable with the Son: the "Father" in his noon glory, he became the "Son" at Sun-rise. when he was said to "be born." This idea received its full apotheosis annually on December the 25th, during the Vernal Solstice, when the Sun—hence the solar gods of all the nations—was said to be born. *Natalis solis invicte.* And the "precursor" of the resurrecting Sun *grows,* and *waxes strong,* until the vernal equinox, when the god Sol begins its annual course, under the sign of the Ram or the *Lamb,* the first lunar week of the month. The 1st of March was feasted throughout all pagan Greece, as its *neomenia* was sacred to Diana. Christian nations celebrate their Easter, for the same reason, on the first Sunday that fol-

---

[1] From *pro,* "before," and *fanum,* "the temple," *i.e.,* the non-initiates who stood before the fane, but dared not enter it.—(*Vide* the Works of Ragon.)

[2] The Earth, and the Moon, its parent, are interchangeable. Thus all the lunar godesses were also the representative symbols of the Earth.—*Vide Secret Doctrine, Symbolism.*

lows the full moon, at the Vernal Equinox. With the festivals of the Pagans, the canonicals of their priests and Hierophants were copied by Christendom. Will this be denied? In his "Life of Constantine" Eusebius confesses—thus saying, perhaps, the only truth he ever uttered in his life—that "in order to render Christianity *more attractive to the Gentiles, the priests* (of Christ) *adopted the exterior vestments and ornaments used in the pagan cult.*" He might have added "their rituals" and dogmas also.

III

It is a matter of History—however unreliable the latter—for a number of facts preserved by ancient writers corroborate it, that Church Ritualism and Freemasonry have sprung from the same source, and developed hand in hand. But as Masonry, even with its errors and later innovations, was far nearer the truth than the Church, the latter began very soon her persecutions against it. Masonry was, in its origin, simply archaic Gnosticism, or early esoteric Christianity; Church Ritualism was, and *is, exoteric paganism,* pure and simple—*remodelled,* we do not say *reformed.* Read the works of Ragon, a Mason who forgot more than the Masons of to-day know. Study, collating them together, the casual but numerous statements made by Greek and Latin writers, many of whom were Initiates, most learned Neophytes and partakers of the Mysteries. Read carefully the elaborate and venomous slanders of the Church Fathers against the Gnostics, the Mysteries and their Initiates —and you may end by unravelling the truth. It is a few philosophers who, driven by the political events of the day, tracked and persecuted by the fanatical Bishops of early Christianity—who had yet neither fixed ritual nor dogmas nor Church—it is these Pagans who founded the latter. Blending most ingeniously the truths of the Wisdom-religion with the exoteric fictions so dear to the ignorant mobs, it is they who laid the first foundations of ritualistic Churches and of the Lodges of modern Masonry. The latter fact was demonstrated by Ragon in his ANTE-OMNIÆ of the modern Liturgy compared with the ancient Mysteries, and showing the rituals conducted by the early Masons; the former may be ascertained by a like comparison of the Church canonicals, the sacred vessels, and the festivals of the Latin and other Churches, with those of the pagan nations. But Churches and Masonry have widely diverged since the days when both were one. If asked how a profane can know it, the answer comes: ancient and modern Free-

masonry are an obligatory study with every Eastern Occultist.

Masonry, its paraphernalia and modern innovations (the Biblical Spirit in it especially) notwithstanding, does good both on the moral and physical planes—or did so, hardly ten years ago, at any rate.[3] It was a true *ecclesia* in the sense of fraternal union and mutual help, the only *religion* in the world, if we regard the term as derived from the word *religare,* "to bind" together, as it made all men belonging to it "brothers"—regardless of *race* and *faith.* Whether with the enormous wealth at its command it could not do far more than it does now, is no business of ours. We see no visible, crying evil from this institution, and no one yet, save the Roman Church, has ever been found to show that it did any harm. Can *Church* Christianity say as much? Let ecclesiastical and profane history answer the question. For one, it has divided the whole mankind into Cains and Abels; it has slaughtered millions in the name of her God—the Lord of *Hosts,* truly, the ferocious Jehovah Sabbaoth—and instead of giving an impetus to civilization, the favorite boast of her followers—it has retarded it during the long and weary Mediæval ages. It is only under the relentless assaults of science and the revolt of men trying to free themselves, that it began to lose ground and could no longer arrest enlightenment. Yet has it not softened, as claimed, the "barbarous spirit of Heathendom"? We say no, most emphatically. It is Churchianity with its *odium theologicum,* since it could no longer repress human progress, which infused its lethal spirit of intolerance, its ferocious selfishness, greediness, and cruelty into modern civilization under the mask of *cant* and meek Christianity. When were the Pagan Cæsars more bloodthirsty or more coolly cruel than are the modern Potentates and their armies? When did the millions of the Proletariat starve as they do now? When has mankind shed more tears and suffered than at present?

Yes; there was a day when the Church and Masonry were one. These were centuries of intense moral reaction, a transitional period of thought as heavy as a nightmare, an age of strife. Thus, when the creation of new ideals led to the apparent pulling down of the old fanes and the destruction of old idols, it ended in reality with the rebuilding of those temples out of old materials, and the erection of the same idols under new names. It was a universal re-arrangement and white wash-

[3] Since the origin of Masonry, the split between the British and American Masons and the French "Grand Orient" of the "Widow's Sons" is the first one that has ever occurred. It bids fair to make of these two sections of Masonry a Masonic Protestant and a Roman Catholic Church, as far as regards ritualism and brotherly love, at all events.

ing—but only skin deep. History will never be able to tell us—but tradition and judicious research do—how many semi-Hierophants and even high Initiates were forced to become renegades in order to ensure the survival of the secrets of Initiation. Prætextatus, pro-consul at Achaia, is credited with remarking in the IVth century of our era, that "to deprive the Greeks of the sacred mysteries *which bind together the whole mankind* was equivalent to depriving them of their life." The Initiates took perhaps the hint, and thus joining *nolens volens* the followers of the new faith, then becoming all domineering, acted accordingly. Some hellenized Jewish Gnostics did the same; and thus more than one "Clemens Alexandrinus"—a convert to all appearance, an ardent Neo-Platonist and the same philosophical *pagan* at heart—became the instructor of ignorant Christian Bishops. In short the convert *malgré lui* blended the two external mythologies, the old and the new, and while giving out the compound to the masses, kept the sacred truths for himself.

The kind of Christians they made may be inferred from the example of Synesius, the Neo-Platonist. What scholar is ignorant of the fact, or would presume to deny, that the favourite and devoted pupil of Hypatia—the virgin-philosopher, the martyr and victim of the infamous Cyril of Alexandria—had not even been baptised when first offered by the bishops of Egypt the Episcopalian See of the Ptolemaïd? Every student is aware that, when finally baptised, after having accepted the office proffered, it was so *skin-deep* that he actually signed his consent only after his conditions had been complied with and his future privileges guaranteed. What the chief clause was, is curious. It was a *sine qua non* condition that he was to be allowed to abstain from professing the (Christian) doctrines, that he, the new Bishop did not believe in! Thus, although baptised and ordained in the degrees of deaconship, priesthood, and episcopate, he never separated himself from his wife, never gave up his Platonic philosophy, nor even his sport so strictly forbidden to every other bishop. This occurred as late as the Vth century.

Such transactions between initiated philosophers and ignorant priests of reformed Judaism were numerous in those days. The former sought to save their "mystery-vows" and personal dignity, and to do so they had to resort to a much-to-be-regretted compromise with ambition, ignorance, and the rising wave of popular fanaticism. They believed in Divine Unity, the ONE or *Solus,* unconditioned and unknowable;

and still they consented to render public homage and pay reverence to *Sol,* the Sun moving among his twelve apostles, the 12 signs of the Zodiac, *alias* the 12 Sons of Jacob. The *hoi polloi* remaining ignorant of the former, worshipped the latter, and in them, their old time-honoured gods. To transfer that worship from the solar-lunar and other cosmic deities to the Thrones, Archangels, Dominions, and Saints was no difficult matter; the more so since the said sidereal dignities were received into the new Christian Canon with their old names almost unchanged. Thus, while, during Mass, the "Grand Elect" reiterated, under his breath, his absolute adherence to the Supreme Universal Unity of the "incomprehensible Workman," and pronounced in solemn and loud tones the "Sacred Word" (now substituted by the Masonic "Word at low breath"), his assistant proceeded with the chanting of the *Kyriel* of names of those inferior sidereal beings whom the masses were made to worship. To the profane catechumen, indeed, who had offered prayers but a few months or weeks before to the Bull Apis and the holy Cynocephalus, to the sacred ibis and the hawk-headed Osiris, St. John's eagle[4] and the divine Dove (witness of the Baptism while hovering over the Lamb of God), must have appeared as the most natural development and sequence to his own national and sacred zoology, which he had been taught to worship since the day of his birth.

IV

It may thus be shown that both modern Freemasonry and Church ritualism descend in direct line from initiated Gnostics, Neo-Platonists.

---

[4] It is an error to say that John the Evangelist became the patron Saint of Masonry only after the XVI century, and it implies a double mistake. Between John the "Divine," the "Seer" and the writer of *Revelation,* and John the Evangelist who is now shown in the company of the Eagle, there is a great difference, as the latter John is a creation of Irenæus, along with the fourth gospel. Both were the result of the quarrel of the Bishop of Lyons with the Gnostics, and no one will ever tell what was the real name of the writer of the grandest of the Evangels. But what we do know is, that the Eagle is the legal property of John, the author of the Apocalypsis, written originally centuries B.C., and only *re-edited,* before receiving canonical hospitality. This John, or *Oannes,* was the accepted patron of all the Egyptian and Greek Gnostics (who were the early Builders or *Masons* of "Solomon's Temple," as, earlier, of the Pyramids) from the beginning of time. The *Eagle* was his attribute, the most archaic of symbols—being the Egyptian *Ah,* the bird of Zeus, and sacred to the Sun with every ancient people. Even the Jews adopted it among the Initiated Kabalists, as "the symbol of the Sephirah Tiph-e-reth, the spiritual Æther or air," says Mr. Myer's "Qabbalah." With the Druids the eagle was the symbol of the Supreme Deity, and again a portion of the cherubic symbol. Adopted by the pre-Christian Gnostics, it could be seen at the foot of the *Tau* in Egypt, before it was placed in the Rose-Croix degree at the foot of the Christian cross. Pre-eminently the bird of the Sun, the Eagle is necessarily connected with every solar god, and is the symbol of every seer who looks into the astral light, and sees in it the shadows of the Past, Present, and Future, as easily as the Eagle looks at the Sun.

and renegade Hierophants of the Pagan Mysteries, the secrets of which they have lost, but which have been nevertheless preserved by those who would not compromise. If both Church and Masons are willing to forget the history of their true origin, the theosophists are not. They repeat: Masonry and the three great Christian religions are all inherited goods. The "ceremonies and passwords" of the former, and the prayers, dogmas, and rites of the latter, are travestied copies of pure Paganism (copied and borrowed as diligently by the Jews), and of Neo-Platonic theosophy. Also, that the "passwords" used even now by Biblical Masons and connected with "the tribe of Judah," "Tubal-Cain," and other Zodiacal dignitaries of the Old Testament, are the Jewish *aliases* of the ancient gods of the heathen *mobs,* not of the Hierogrammatists, the interpreters of the *true* mysteries. That which follows proves it well. The good Masonic Brethren could hardly deny that in name they are *Solicoles* indeed, the worshippers of the Sun in heaven, in whom the erudite Ragon saw such a magnificent symbol of the G.A.O.T.U.—which it surely is. Only the trouble he had was to prove—which no one can—that the said G.A.O.T.U. was not rather the *Sol* of the small exoteric fry of the *Pro-fanes* than the *Solus* of the High *Epoptai.* For the secret of the fires of SOLUS, the spirit of which radiates in the "Blazing Star," is a Hermetic secret which, unless a Mason studies *true* theosophy, is lost to him for ever. He has ceased to understand now, even the little indiscretions of Tshuddi. To this day Masons and Christians keep the Sabbath sacred, and call it the "Lord's" day; yet they know as well as any that both *Sunday,* and the *Sonntag* of Protestant England and Germany, mean the Sun-day or the *day of the Sun,* as it meant 2,000 years ago.

And you, Reverend and good Fathers, Priests, Clergymen, and Bishops, you who so charitably call theosophy "idolatry" and doom its adherents openly and privately to eternal perdition, can you boast of one single rite, vestment, or sacred vessel in church or temple that does not come to you from paganism? Nay, to assert it would be too dangerous, in view, not only of history, but also of the confessions of your own priestly craft.

Let us recapitulate if only to justify our assertions.

> "Roman sacrificers had to confess before sacrificing," writes du Choul. The priests of Jupiter donned a tall, square, black cap (*Vide* Armenian and Greek modern priests), the head dress of the *Flamines.* The black *soutane* of the Roman Catholic priest is the black *hiero-*

coraces, the loose robe of the Mithraic priests, so-called from being *raven* coloured (raven, *corax*). The King-Priest of Babylon had a golden seal-ring and slippers kissed by the conquered potentates, a white mantle, a tiara of gold, to which two bandelets were suspended. The popes have the seal-ring and the slippers for the same use; a white satin mantle bordered with golden stars, a tiara with two bejewelled bandelets suspended to it, etc., etc. The white linen *alb* (*alba vestis*) is the garment of the priests of *Isis;* the top of the heads of the priests of Anubis was shaven (*Juvenal*), hence the tonsure; the *chasuble* of the Christian *"Father"* is the copy from the upper garment of the Phœnician priest-sacrificers, a garment called *calasiris,* tied at the neck and descending to their *heels.* The *stole* comes to our priests from the female garment worn by the *Galli,* the male—*Nautches* of the temple, whose office was that of the Jewish *Kadashim;* (*Vide* II, Kings xxiii, 7, for the true word) their *belt of purity* (?) from the *ephod* of the Jews, and the *Isiac* cord; the priests of Isis being vowed to chastity. (*Vide* Ragon, for details.)

The ancient pagans used *holy* water or lustrations to purify their cities, fields, temples, and men, just as it is being done now in Roman Catholic countries. Fonts stood at the door of every temple, full of lustral water and called *favisses* and *aquiminaria.* Before sacrificing, the pontiff or the *curion* (whence the French *curé*), dipping a laurel branch into the lustral water, sprinkled with it the pious congregation assembled, and that which was then termed *lustrica* and *aspergilium* is now called sprinkler (or *goupillon,* in French). The latter was with the priestesses of Mithra the symbol of the Universal *lingam.* Dipped during the Mysteries in lustral milk, the faithful were sprinkled with it. It was the emblem of Universal fecundity; hence the use of the holy water in Christianity, a rite of phallic origin. More than this; the idea underlying it is purely occult and belongs to ceremonial magic. Lustrations were performed by fire, sulphur, air, and water. To draw the attention of the celestial gods, *ablutions* were resorted to; to conjure the nether gods away, *aspersion* was used.

The vaulted ceilings of cathedrals and churches, Greek or Latin, are often painted blue and studded with golden stars, to represent the canopy of the heavens. This is copied from the Egyptian temples, where solar and star worship was performed. Again, the same reverence is paid in Christian and Masonic architecture to the Orient (or the Eastern point) as in the days of Paganism. Ragon described it fully in his destroyed volumes. The *princeps porta,* the door of the world, and of the "King of Glory," by whom was meant at first the Sun, and now

his human symbol, the Christ, is the door of the Orient, and faces the East in every church and temple.[5] It is through this "door of life"—the solemn pathway, through which the daily entrance of the luminary into the *oblong square*[6] of the earth or the Tabernacle of the Sun is effected every morning—that the "newly born" babe is ushered, and carried to the baptismal font; and it is to the left of this edifice (the gloomy north whither start the "apprentices," and where the candidates got their *trial by water*) that now the fonts, and in the days of old the well (*piscinas*) of lustral waters, were placed in the ancient churches, which had been pagan fanes. The altars of heathen Lutetia were buried, and found again under the choir of *Notre-Dame* of Paris, its ancient lustral wells existing to this day in the said Church. Almost every great ancient Church on the Continent that antedates the Middle Ages was once a pagan temple in virtue of the orders issued by the Bishops and Popes of Rome. Gregory the Great (Platine *en sa Vie*) commands the monk Augustine, his missionary in England, in this wise: "Destroy the idols, never the temples! Sprinkle them with holy water, place in them relics, and let the nations worship in the places they are accustomed to." We have but to turn to the works of Cardinal Baronius, to find in the year XXXVIth of his *Annals* his confession. The Holy Church, he says, was *permitted to appropriate the rites and ceremonies used by the pagans in their idolatrous cult,* since she (the Church) *expiated them by her consecration!* In the *Antiquités Gauloises* (Book II, Ch. 19) by Fauchet, we read that the Bishops of France adopted and *used the pagan ceremonies in order to convert followers to Christ.*

This was when Gaul was still a pagan country. Are the same rites and ceremonies used now in Christian France, and other Roman Catholic countries, still going on in grateful remembrance of the pagans and their gods?

V

Up to the IVth century the churches knew of no altars. Up to that date the altar was a *table* raised in the middle of the temple, for pur-

---

[5] Except, perhaps, the temples and chapels of dissident Protestants, which are built anywhere, and used for more than one purpose. In America I know of chapels hired for fairs and shows, and even theatres; to-day a chapel, the day after sold for debts, and fitted for a gin shop or a public house. I speak of chapels, of course, not of Churches and Cathedrals.

[6] A Masonic term; a symbol of the Arks of Noah, and of the Covenant, of the Temple of Solomon, the Tabernacle, and the Camp of the Israelites, all built as "oblong squares." Mercury and Apollo were represented by oblong cubes and squares, and so is Kaaba, the great temple at Mecca.

poses of *Communion,* or fraternal repasts (the *Cœna,* as mass was originally said in the evening). In the same way now the table is raised in the "Lodge" for Masonic Banquets, which usually close the proceedings of a Lodge and at which the resurrected Hiram Abifs, the "Widow's Sons," honour their toasts by *firing,* a Masonic mode of transubstantiation. Shall we call their banquet tables *altars* also? Why not? The altars were copies from the *ara maxima* of pagan Rome. The Latins placed square and oblong stones near their tombs. and called them *ara,* altar; they were consecrated to the gods *Lares* and *Manes.* Our altars are a derivation from these square stones, another form of the boundary stones known as the gods *Termini*—the Hermeses, and the Mercuries, whence *Mercurius quadratus, quadriceps, quadrifrons,* etc., etc., the *four-faced* gods, whose symbols these square stones were, from the highest antiquity. The stone on which the ancient kings of Ireland were crowned was such an "altar." Such a stone is in Westminster Abbey, endowed, moreover, with a voice. Thus our altars and thrones descend directly from the priapic boundary stones of the pagans—the gods *termini.*

Shall the church-going reader feel very indignant if he is told that the Christians adopted the *pagan* way of worshipping *in a temple,* only during the reign of Diocletianus? Up to that period they had an insurmountable horror for altars and temples, and held them in abomination for the first 250 years of our era. These primitive Christians were Christians indeed; the moderns are more pagan than any ancient idolators. The former were the *Theosophists* of those days; from IVth century they became Helleno-Judaic Gentiles *minus* the philosophy of the Neo-Platonists. Read what Minutius Felix says in the IIIrd century to the Romans:

> You fancy that we (Christians) conceal that which we worship because *we will have neither temples nor altars?* But what image of God shall we raise, since Man is himself God's image? What temple can we build to the Deity, when the Universe, which is Its work, can hardly contain It? How shall we enthrone the power of such Omnipotence in a single building? Is it not far better to consecrate to the Deity a temple in our heart and spirit?

But then the *Chres*tians of the type of Minutius Felix had in their mind the commandment of the MASTER-INITIATE, *not to pray in the synagogues and temples* as the *hypocrites* do, "that they may be seen of men." (Matthew vi, 5). They remembered the declaration of Paul, the Apostle-Initiate, the "Master Builder" (I Corinthians iii, 10), that

MAN was the one temple of God, in which the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of God dwelleth; (*Ibid*). They obeyed the truly Christian precepts, whereas the modern Christians obey but the arbitrary canons of their respective churches, and the rules of their Elders. "Theosophists are notorious Atheists," exclaims a writer in the "Church Chronicle." "Not one of them is ever known to attend divine service . . . the Church is obnoxious to them"; and forthwith uncorking the vials of his wrath, he pours out their contents on the *infidel, heathen* F.T.S. The modern Churchman stones the Theosophist as his ancient forefather, the Pharisee of the "Synagogue of the Libertines" (*Acts* vi, 9) stoned Stephen, for saying that which even many Christian Theosophists say, namely that "the Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands" (*Ibid.* 48); and they "suborn men" just as these iniquitous judges did (*Ibid.* 11) to testify against us.

Forsooth, friends, you are indeed the righteous descendants of your predecessors, whether of the colleagues of Saul, or of those of Pope Leo X. the cynical author of the ever famous sentence: "How useful to us this *fable* of Christ," *"Quantum nobis prodest hac fabula Christi!"*

VI

The "Solar Myth" theory has become in our day stale—*ad nauseam*—repeated as we hear it from the four cardinal points of Orientalism and Symbolism, and applied indiscriminately to all things and all religions, except Church Christianity and state-religion. No doubt the Sun was throughout the whole antiquity and since days immemorial the symbol of the Creative Deity—with every nation, not with the Parsis alone; but so he is with the Ritualists. As in days of old, so it is now. Our central star is the "Father" for the *pro-fanes,* the Son of the ever unknowable Deity for the Epoptai. Says the same Mason, Ragon, "the Sun was the most sublime and natural image of the GREAT ARCHITECT. as the most ingenious of all the allegories under which the moral and good man (the *true sage*) had ever endowed infinite and limitless *Intelligence.*" Apart from the latter assumption, Ragon is right; for he shows this symbol gradually receding from the ideal so represented and conceived, and becoming finally from a symbol the original, in the minds of his ignorant worshippers. Then the great Masonic author proves that it is the *physical* Sun which was regarded as both the Father and the Son by the early Christians.

> "Oh, initiated Brethren," he exclaims. "Can you forget that in the temples of the existing religion a large *lamp* burns night and day? It

is suspended in front of the chief altar, the depository of the ark of the Sun. Another *lamp* burning before the altar of the virgin-mother is the emblem of the light of the *moon.* Clemens Alexandrinus tells us that the Egyptians were the first to establish the religious use of the lamps. . . . Who does not know that the most sacred and terrible duty was entrusted to the Vestals? If the Masonic temples are lighted with three astral lights, the *sun,* the *moon,* and the *geometrical star,* and with three vital lights, this Hierophant and his two *Episcopes* (Wardens, in French *Surveillants*), it is because one of the Fathers of Masonry, the learned Pythagoras, ingenuously suggests that we should not speak of divine things without a light. Pagans celebrated a festival of lamps called *Lampadophorics* in honour of Minerva, Prometheus, and Vulcan. But Lactantius and some of the earliest fathers of the new faith complained bitterly of this pagan introduction of lamps in the Churches; 'If they deigned,' writes Lactantius, *'to contemplate that light which we call the* SUN, they would soon recognise that *God has no need of their lamps.'* And Vigilantius adds 'Under the pretext of religion the Church established a Gentile custom of lighting vile candles, while the SUN is there illuminating us with a thousand lights. *Is it not a great honour* for the LAMB OF GOD (the sun thus represented), *which placed in the middle of the throne* (the universe) *fills it with the radiance of his Majesty?'* Such passages prove to us that in those days the primitive Church worshipped THE GREAT ARCHITECT OF THE WORLD in its image the SUN, sole of its kind." (*The Mass and its Mysteries,* pp. 19 and 20.)

Indeed, while Christian candidates have to pronounce the Masonic oath turned to the East and that their "Venerable" keeps in the Eastern corner, because the Neophytes were made to do the same during the Pagan Mysteries, the Church has, in her turn, preserved the identical rite. During the High Mass, the High-Altar (*ara-maxima*) is ornamented with the Tabernacle, or the pyx (the box in which the HOST is kept), and with six lighted tapers. The esoteric meaning of the pyx and contents—the symbol of the Christ-Sun—is that it represents the resplendent luminary, and the six tapers the six planets (the early Christians knowing of no more), three on his right and three on his left. This is a copy of the seven-branched candlestick of the synagogue, which has an identical meaning. *"Sol est Dominus Meus"* "the Sun is my Lord!" exclaims David in Psalm xcv, translated very ingeniously in the authorized version by "The Lord is a great God," "a great King *above* all Gods" (v,3), or planets truly! Augustin Chalis is more sincere in his *Philosophie des Religions Compareés* (Vol. II, p. 18), when he writes:

> All are devs (demons), on this Earth, save the God of the Seers (Initiates) the sublime IAO; and *if in Christ you see aught than* the SUN, then you adore a *dev,* a phantom such as are all the children of night.

The East being the cardinal point whence arises the luminary of the Day, the great giver and sustainer of life, the creator of all that lives and breathes on this globe, what wonder if all the nations of the Earth worshipped in him the visible agent of the invisible Principle and Cause; and that *mass* should be said in the honour of him who is the giver of *messis* or "harvest." But between worshipping the ideal as a *whole,* and the physical symbol, a part chosen to represent that whole and the ALL, there is an abyss. For the learned Egyptian, the Sun was the "eye" of Osiris, not Osiris himself; the same for the learned Zoroastrians. For the early Christians the Sun became *the* Deity, *in toto;* and by dint of casuistics, sophistry, and dogmas not to be questioned, the modern Christian churches have contrived to force even the educated world to accept the same, while hypnotising it into a belief that *their* god is the one living true Deity, the maker of, *not the Sun*—a demon worshipped by the "heathen." But what may be the difference between a wicked demon, and the anthropomorphic God, *e.g.,* as represented in Solomon's Proverbs? That "God," unless poor, helpless, ignorant men call upon him, when their "fear cometh as desolation" and their "destruction as a whirlwind," threatens them in such words as these: "I will *laugh* at your calamities, I will *mock* when your fear cometh!" (Prov. i, 27.) Identify this God with the great Avatar on whom the Christian legend is hung; make him one with that true Initiate who said, "Blessed are they that mourn; for they shall be comforted": and what is the result? Such identification alone is quite sufficient to justify the fiendish joy of Tertullian, who laughed and rejoiced at the idea of his *infidel* next of kin roasting in hell-fire; the advice of Hieronymus to the Christian convert to trample over the body of his pagan mother, if she seeks to prevent him *leaving her for ever* to follow Christ; and it makes of all the Church tyrants, murderers, and *omnes gentes* of the Inquisition, the grandest and noblest exemplars of *practical* Christianity that have ever lived!

PERSPECTIVE ON THE BIBLE

WHEN a Theosophist turns to a consideration of the Bible, he does so, ideally, from a perspective gained by a sympathetic reading of many scriptures. The Theosophist also approaches the study of scripture from the standpoint of there being a *gnosis*—true knowledge about the soul-nature of man—which has been represented in various ways at various times. This is an ancient doctrine of India, and it is therefore fitting that we possess the greatest gifts, in the way of religious scriptures, from India.

In 1888, H. P. Blavatsky, who alone caused the name Theosophy to take on vital meaning in the Western world, wrote in her magazine *Lucifer* a series of articles entitled "The Esoteric Character of the Gospels." This series suggests the theosophical point of view: the looking within the form of scripture for hidden meaning. This is the way one must study the *Dhammapada* or the *Upanishads,* but is especially necessary in learning to know the *Bhagavad-Gita* and the Christian Bible; in both, we find the doctrine and teachings involved in a very complicated symbolism. At the outset of Madame Blavatsky's series of articles, she devoted herself to a consideration of the meaning of the word Christ: after all, the two most important words in Christianity upon which we might wish to gain perspective are the words God and Christ.

There is clear historical evidence to show that the term *Christos* was a term very much in use among Greek philosophers five centuries before Christ. This term, though variously used, represented the highest spiritual capacity of every human being—a divine principle, universal in that it was the root and the sustainer of each man. Therefore, in these terms, "Christ" becomes the Christ within. Christ is the spirit which makes ethical growth possible. Christ cannot be localized in any one person. If we turn to the word God, we find something of similar significance, and note a correlation between what may be said from a theosophical point of view about the word Christ or Christos, and about the word God. First, we discover statements in Genesis which suggest that "God" was also meant to have a universal meaning, that God was not supposed to represent *a* being, but to indicate the creative potency of nature—we might say the Universal Mind, which galvanized matter into new forms, preparing the way for a new day in evolutionary experience for all the beings involved.

It has been pointed out that the word God was a plural, not a singular, word in the original Hebrew. *Theos,* too, stood esoterically for a *collectivity,* which represented the total deific power in Nature. But just as Christ was made by theological Christians to play the role of a single unique Being, so God was made into a single locus of power. We discover in Genesis 1:26, however, that "God" said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." The plural here is very apparent —a symbolic reference to Beings who have divine creative power, gained in former evolutions. We find the same suggested in other places. After the "fall" of man in the Garden of Eden, we have this statement: "And the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil." Again the plural—man is become as one of *us!*

Now we may turn to one of the ancient doctrines preserved in Eastern scripture and presented in H. P. Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine,* for this is a very clear correlation with the teaching that beings of higher capacity have developed the Fire of Mind beyond that of the average, and are therefore creative in an ultimate sense. These beings, it is taught, who are Elder Brothers to those who are less progressed, are able to light up the minds of men in the way that a parent lights up the mind of a child.

The "fire," of course, is that of self-consciousness. Just as self-consciousness cannot be attained without the aid of the mind-fire of an adult, so with the early races of men who were not *quite* men; there had to be this additional flame of self-conscious wisdom to awaken latent capacities. So the "creation of man" refers to what has been called in theosophical scripture "the lighting up of *Manas,*" the Mind principle. In Genesis 2:7, it is said: "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Here is reference to the same doctrine we find in Eastern scripture—the awakening of the latent capacities of the human mind, an esoteric teaching within the exoteric.

We also encounter in Genesis the symbolism of the Garden of Eden and of the Fall of Man. This, too, is a universal allegory, because the Garden of Eden portrays a state of universal innocence, a purity in absence of experience which characterized what has been termed the Golden Age—an age of irresponsibility. The "serpent" who invites the eating of the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge does not speak as a

symbol of evil when he says, "God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened; and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." The serpent takes on an entirely different interpretation in theosophical perspective, for in ancient times the serpent typified wisdom. After eating of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, Man becomes a potential god—a creator and a destroyer. "God" informs Adam and Eve of this in Genesis; then comes a gradual disintegration of the peace and harmony symbolized by Eden. "Wickedness" spreads throughout the world as man exercises his godlike right to *make mistakes.*

The suggestion that there were but two people created by God—Adam, and then Eve—is ridiculous even according to biblical text. It is quite apparent that here is further correlation with the Indian teachings, concerning races of men arriving *together,* according to natural law, in a new cycle of evolution, to take up their evolutionary journey. We shouldn't say on a new planet, but in a new cycle of evolution, for we discover that *men* appeared. For in Genesis, God blessed *them* and said unto *them*—again the plural. Adam and Eve, then, represent races and conditions of creation. The separation of the sexes, in the archaic scriptures of the East, was the evolutionary development of bi-sexuality—a natural part of a vast evolutionary process. We see also in Genesis that there was—as in the days of Greek mythology—intercourse between gods and men. Each human being was a god-like being of power and promise. We find, for example, that Genesis 6:2 speaks of the coming together of gods and men: "The sons of Gods saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose." And then, after the sons of God came to the daughters of men, they bore children to them; the same became mighty men, men of renown. Here, again, we have the suggestion of the incarnation of higher intelligence, making it possible for the incarnation of those beings who needed new habitations—created by the evolutionary processes of the physical world, plus the infusion of the fire of mind by higher beings. This habitat would be suitable for "men of renown," souls awaiting incarnation. Basic symbolisms occur throughout Genesis. The story of Noah is again the story of a Race. In the Hindu scriptures Noah is the Manu—a representation, whether as a great being or a collectivity of beings, of the seed for a new race existing after the cycle of one period of evolution had ended.

When we turn to the New Testament, we discover other basic symbols, for example, the "virgin birth." As H. P. Blavatsky showed in *Isis*, both Buddha and Krishna, as well as Christ, were born of virgins, suggesting that great beings come to earth under conditions which are *different*. There is no real basis in the scriptures for the ridiculous idea of *physical* virginity preceding birth. Matthew suggests that there was an unusual relation between Joseph and his wife, *after* the conception of Jesus. The symbolism here leads in many directions, indicating, perhaps, that purity—as any man of philosophic mind is sure to feel—is never a technical thing. Purity is of attitude, and "chastity" and "virginity," in any meaningful sense, have to do with a *psychological condition*. There is also the suggestion, in the discussion of Mary and her status in society, that from the lowliest may come the greatest—that we may not judge, on the basis of association or past action as we view it, the quality or nature of any being. In the *Dhammapada,* Buddha speaks of a "lily blooming from a rubbish heap," and we find H.P.B. saying that precious metal may be found in most unlikely places. All of this takes us back to the *Christos*—and to recognition that every man, regardless of his apparent capacity, will discover in time his true heritage. "Judge not that ye be not judged" is only part of Christ's message. Judge not, because no man *may be judge,* carries the full meaning.

In the Sermon on the Mount, Christ asserts the psychological content of his teaching. For example, referring to the Commandments, he says (Matt. 5:21,22): "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment; But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment." In other words, it is the psychological attitude which makes culpability. Christ calls upon man to recognize that he is not just a creature who must follow certain laws or be punished, but that he is a divine being—if he will only become aware of it. Therefore he must guard his innermost thoughts: "When thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites are; for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward. But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and, when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret." This is an invocation of the Higher Self—the only prayer which combines responsibility and freedom.

THE MAGIC POTENCY

SPEECH is said to be an occult power of magnitude. Verbal speech is magic potency, embodying the idea. Its original is in the primeval "Word," whence cosmos originated. And as the utterance of primeval *Sound* brought forth the World, so every word uttered by man creates; as Universal Mind ideates, so do all minds copy. All Life has speech, but to man alone is given the power to thus create in all directions without let or hindrance.

It is taught that no action is carried out, whether of speech, mind, or body, without the help of those forces of Nature acting outside the borderline of our visible perceptions. These forces are instruments, agents, channels, whereby communication takes place. Since the universe lives in all its parts, and life dominates all, the "lives" are universal, they are wherever man is. The manasic entity, man, is lord over the forces of Nature, which are galvanized by his thinking, and which owe their identity to man the Thinker. Life fills every point of space, and every particle in space is a "life" undergoing probationary development. Each serves the All. Each has its impulsions received and propulsions transmitted, each is subject to the impulsions from a higher layer of Life. Thus, the mission of the Planetary Spirit, Theosophy teaches, is to strike for the coming Cycle the keynote of truth; this primeval Vibration will carry throughout. It is departure from this keynote, or adherence to it, by the masses of humankind, which spells the difference between gain and loss, salvation and destruction of works. Man stands in the middle place. As his "speech" may condemn, so it may also resurrect him from the "dead."

Everyone knows the effect of a terse syllogism, the influence of a well-chosen expression, delivered in the right tone. Some words, it is said, once heard are never to be forgotten—those which by association, or peculiar vibration, arouse "innate ideas"—themselves deriving from the primeval "keynote of truth." Long ago these may have been a kind of metered magic which was a spoken chant, and by this utterance the great truths of man's being and destiny were imparted. We do know from experience that hidden influences attach to certain musical compositions, influencing to action in one or another direction, internally as well as externally. The capacity of slogans to compel the mind

of masses of people is a commonplace, fraught with peril. Perhaps the property of the mantram is sevenfold, corresponding to all other natural properties. How do mantrams differ from ordinary speech? In degree of influence, it would seem.

There are those minds capable of brilliantly focalizing thought, and this for purposes either beneficent or otherwise. Other minds, not so capable, are swayed accordingly by the stronger, the acutely concentrated. Great masses of men are thus moved by forces they do not suspect, and through ignorance, through aroused fancy, through happy instinct, or through deluded imagination, lend their unwitting will to effect designs they do not originate and do not control—all of which further galvanizes Nature's forces along the lines directed. Imagine the effects of an entire assembly, or even the populace, in displeasure, or the rage of the mob upon the elemental world thus dynamized into carrying out orders under such concerted direction! Or again, the effects of a praying assemblage which directs its bequest to "God" for destruction of an enemy nation! Or, to carry the picture a step further, what must be the vision of one vouchsafed insight into the elemental world of today, consequent upon verbal hysteria about the Bomb, affecting, as it is known to do, not only the whole human family, but also Nature's kingdoms by reactions?

Speech is silent or it is uttered. But idea antecedes speech, and idea can be purified or envenomed in accordance with the human principle involved in its utterance. The "color" of the thought and word is taken on by the elemental force embodying it, which makes it thus a force of one of three kinds: innocuous and harmless; good and creative; destructive and evil. These three qualities subsist in Nature. Any revengeful thought makes the appropriate matrix in substance of the nature of mind-stuff, attracting to it all the classes of messenger-beings having to do with the individual and his type of thinking. Every man has his own "current" which he peoples with his own virtues and vices, often differing but in degree from those of another.

Thought attracts. Each thought becomes its own genius. This is Nature's Law and Nature herself in action. Hence, one should beware of thinking long and deep upon *evil,* whether merely from the abstract wish to learn or a judgment of one's fellow. One should not aid that to happen which is not to be preferred, either by use of verbiage or the fully formed ideative "astral" of speech. When one has a thought, it

actuates certain forces; these are then beyond his control. So the Greeks had an axiom apropos in this respect: "Nothing too much!" Needless verbiage, like needless food, will only result in "word-fatness" and like complaints. When one does not get rid of excess it proves a hindrance. Some words we use innocently are veritable narcotics. By overuse, one attracts correspondingly. Who cares to saturate himself thus with the astral light to the point of intoxication? Many are the unwary "talkers" among us today! There is never any better precept to remember in our daily doings than the one which assures us that "ignorance is no excuse—even if there be extenuations—in the eyes of the Law."

"Words," said W. Q. Judge, "are winged messengers." All Teachers enjoin men to "be restrained, liberal, merciful. It is the death of selfishness." It neutralizes great risk. A "harsh word," uttered, polarizes the forces in opposite directions. The cause, once set going, meets the immediate opposition of another *manasic* entity, who may exert his powers the more forcefully to counteract the first. What happens then in the kingdoms which it is man's first duty to elevate, to raise to a higher level of evolutionary being? Millions of persons who live in daily fear of very survival, fail, by the misuses of the potency of speech, to counteract either the effects of fear or its cause. The Forces must be energized and entified in the reverse direction, for they are the karmic agents which bring to us our lives of weal and woe, as we ordain.

To Speak Carefully

The gross material facts of the world are ready at hand for use in giving mode to the truths drawn from the well of being; and literature and art and history and philosophy and science are the crafts that shape the disembodied truth and make it concrete. Anyone who has the temerity to speak of "truth" usually finds that he is performing verbal dances around the *word* truth, rather than letting truth perform for itself. The truth is as hard to talk about as it is to tell, though it is not, I think, so hard to find as people say, nor so ready with a dusty answer. If there is one thing certain, the truth will not be caught *once and for all* in a net of words alone, nor does it like to be imprisoned in a theory; it is much too fond of its liberty.

—WELLER EMBLER

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK—AND ANSWER

SINCE most of the contributors to YCA have "grown up in," or at least spent time with, the classes of ULT's Theosophy School, might it not be interesting to invite individual comment on just what one considers the basic objectives and contributions of Theosophy School?

While one can read a clear account of the School's origin and declared purpose in the Eternal Verities *and* Teacher's Manual, *perhaps each person has his* own *distinctive way of expressing the crux of the enterprise—and perhaps a sharing of various points of view would be both stimulating and instructive. On the basis of such discussion, moreover, one might find new ideas for that constant improvement in educational achievement which should be possible.*

I would consider that the most basic objective of Theosophy School is to help create in the individual a Theosophical attitude—that is, the attitude of the original Theosophical Society—a "search for truth wherever it can be found," the flowering of a deep spirit of inquiry. And it would seem that an individual's ability to sympathize with, at least in part, any and all outlooks on life, to be able to extract the hidden truths behind all doctrinal forms, is primary in any education.

I believe the Jesuits maintain that if they are given a child until the age of seven, almost anything other than Catholic teachings which he might subsequently encounter will fall on deaf ears. This cannot always be true, yet the statement reminds us that the child's whole nature is extremely impressionable; the psychic nature is much more receptive than his mental nature, for he does not yet have the tools with which to evaluate the ideative influences he encounters. Therefore, education, which H.P.B. says in her *Key to Theosophy* should be to the end of producing "free-thinking" young people, must be concerned with developing the tools of evaluation which enable one to deal with life in a judicial manner.

Another basic contribution of Theosophy School, I think, is offering the child opportunity to *participate* in far-reaching ideas, even though many of those ideas are beyond the complete understanding even of most adult minds. Then, instead of "talking" to a child and presenting everything to him, Theosophy School should help the child to relate his own experiences and thoughts to ideas and conceptions considered

by adults. In other words, the child is helped to bridge the gap between his world—which is dominated by psychic impressions—and the adult world which strives to be analytical, logical, intuitional, and judicial. This is a subtle point and one which is very difficult to incorporate in an educational endeavor. A child has a feeling for or against ideas or conceptions which are presented to him, but unless he is helped to "get inside" the ideas with his own experiences, work toward comprehending these ideas and stretching his own conceptions, then he is merely reacting on an emotional level—and this sort of encounter will not produce values able to meet the test of time. Finally, he will probably feel that he is participating in a religion, even though he is told that Theosophy is *not* a religion.

In this case, as the child passes into adolescence, he will begin to question everything that he has heretofore accepted, and he will not have much of Theosophy besides a recollection of doctrine. But if, on the other hand, as he passes out of the completely receptive age and wants to find things out for himself, he has *developed,* not "learned," a desire to see beyond any *form* ideas may be hidden in—if his philosophical "tools" are part of his being—then he will be able to make another transition. He can begin to approach the writings of H.P.B., W.Q.J., and Robert Crosbie with an inspiration of his own. It is surely the attitude of mind one holds that H.P.B. was primarily interested in, and it is that consideration which should be primary to the mind of any Theosophy School teacher.

This is not to say that the doctrines presented in Theosophy, such as karma and reincarnation, the sevenfold classification of man, etc., are not important to children, but it is rather that the child needs to think about what these presentations mean to him. The outlook on life or on a complex situation by someone who believes in karma and/or reincarnation *can* be seen to be more creative, more judicial and complete, than that offered by any other idea. The idea of the sevenfold classification of man *may* suggest the fact that we work through different bodies, that each body plays its role, and that we may learn the proper uses of each. That, as Krishna tries to tell Arjuna, we are none of these bodies or tendencies, but rather the guide of these transitory forms.

As often said in Theosophy, there is some truth in any and all religions. So the religious form or wording of doctrines has only one kind of importance. But the approach to those truths and ideas is equally important. And it is this approach to one's own problems, to one's en-

vironment, to life in general, that Theosophy School should be most concerned in developing.

One other point: The teachers in Theosophy School can learn to expand attitudes, too. Teaching is a give and take of ideas, and there is a sense in which one does not really *know* anything until he can explain it to another. Thus, when one undertakes the role of teaching children—where one cannot rely on the child to "see what we mean" when the thought is fuzzily presented—one is undertaking an education and a discipline of the mind that is very important.

(*To be continued.*)

Which Theosophical ideas or teachings are you simply "holding in mind," which ones do you find you believe, and what in Theosophy do you feel you really know?

In answering this question we must clarify the meaning and implications of *holding in mind, believing* and *knowing*. By "holding in mind," one intends the idea of certain doctrines to be used as working hypotheses for purely impersonal and philosophic consideration—and ultimately to be verified or rejected. By "believing," in its best theosophical sense, the following, we think, is meant: that a man, being endowed with the characteristic of faith (a reflection of his divine nature and without which he couldn't attain to further realization of it), responds *naturally* to certain truths (which, indeed, he himself embodies), and not just because they appeal to his personal desires. The more he confirms his faith therein (and subjects himself to the disciplines and applications involved), the more his belief is supplanted by knowledge —self-knowledge, that is. *Real knowledge* must necessarily transcend relative values, and the necessity for reasoning from premise to conclusion—all knowledge on this plane of existence being relative.

There is a power of direct recognition or intuition, a power which only an Adept has developed to a degree where it becomes always available. Thus we may conclude that ours is the eternal process of trying out in experience those conceptions of Truth which strike a chord deep within our being and to which we respond naturally; intuitional knowledge grows and builds into our natures *unconsciously,* but nonetheless surely, for that is the only way it can come.

There are many theosophic ideas which may be applied to the term *self-evident; i.e.,* Karma is in everything we perceive in nature, and these perceptions we say we surely "know." But the *power to perceive* the self-evidence of these deep truths may, in time, reach to other planes.

MORALITY VERSUS RITUALISM

THE rises and falls of nations and races are inextricably interwoven with the ebb and flow of *moral stamina* in individual human beings. The decay of civilizations is never the result of brute-life force from without, but of the gradually weakening fabric of man's inner being. The darkness of the Middle Ages began, then, not only with Constantine, Eusebius or Cyril, however ambitious and deceitful we may consider these men to have been, but with those faint-hearted members of the Neo-platonic movement who were lacking in moral courage. Too many Neo-platonists resorted finally to the methods of their opponents—the attack and counter-attack of those they considered to be their enemies. Such was the real cause of their downfall. Constantine and his successors only took advantage of the unwisdom and shortsightedness of otherwise good men. "The human weakness that makes priestly domination possible," says Robert Crosbie, "leads to spiritual darkness in the course of time."

Of all expressions of human or divine emotion, true religion is perhaps the deepest. Yet, who can deny that present-day sectarianism (religion so-called) is, for the most part, external and superficial, pertaining to ritualism and form rather than to devotion and morality? This upside-down tenor of the age has led many individuals into the false position of believing there can be true religion *without* ethics, that it is possible to reach heaven without embracing the mental and moral attitudes proper to the heavenly state.

Thomas Paine's well known declaration, "The world is my country; to do good is my religion," seems a clearly defined expression of what true religion should be. Holding the view that religion without personal conviction is a farce, Paine had little respect for formalized sects and creeds. Though a man attend church seven days a week, and donate millions in alms, he is become, in St. Paul's words, as "sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal," unless the element of morality be also present.

There is a great difference, then, between *being* good and *doing* good, between mere *goodness* on the one hand, and *moral courage* on the other. Goodness, of itself, is little more than a passive unconscious expression of the purified *lower Manas;* ethical insight, on the other hand, implies the active union of the *higher* portion of *Manas* with *Buddhi.* A lifetime spent in *goodness* may be enough perhaps to entitle

the Ego to fair surroundings and a host of kind friends in this life—even to a long rest in Devachan—but for strong and deep character, for the permanent enrichment of the reincarnating principle in this and future lives, goodness requires the activating cooperation of knowledge.

The pre-eminent advantage of the present-day Movement over its predecessors lies in the fact that, as yet, it is still young and energetic, and that vast numbers of theosophists the world over, "without professing attachment to any Theosophical organization," are of one mind and heart in pursuit of the grand ideal.

The world evidently still suffers from too much "religion" and too little philosophy. What right have we to hope, so long as this tragic condition remains, that national and international relations will improve? What right have we to believe that community and family institutions, rooted in the soil of these decaying sects and creeds, can summon the courage necessary for dealing with teen-age delinquency? To attempt to reform children without reforming the religious, social, and family life in which they were born and bred is like poulticing the body corporate while leaving the real cause of the disease untouched.

The problem of religious education in the schools would likewise be quickly resolved if religion could be dissociated in the minds of people from its formal and ritualistic side, and identified more fully with its moral side. What objection could any family have to *pure* moral instruction in the schools, if this could be accomplished without sectarian bias or indoctrination? Who could possibly object to having his children taught to be honest and good and kind and true? It was an innate perception of this very need perhaps that elicited the support of many parents for introducing religion into the schools in the first place, for "released time" programs, etc. The difficulty in the matter lies in the fact that moral instruction nowadays is tied with sectarian dogmatism so that it is practically impossible to teach the former without having children subjected also to the latter. Could there be, however, a thoughtful and reverent teaching of universal ethics—such as those propounded by Buddha, Krishna, Confucius, and Jesus—giving the time and country of their origin, the result would be an enrichment of the minds and hearts of children everywhere. Unsectarian moral education would tend to break down deep-rooted antipathies growing out of the differences of race, creed, caste, sex and color. But classes even of this kind would have to be conducted by the secular teacher, and not by priest or

preacher: the latter usually have some particular sectarian interests of their own to promote.

Where is the patriot or nationalist of today who can look with pride upon the religious status of his nation? All can point to vast memberships belonging to the campaigning sects and creeds. But is this true religion? Are we to conclude that because millions of our fellow-citizens have affiliated themselves with formal creeds and sects, we are therefore a "religious" people? We are still under the necessity of learning, evidently, that religion in its primary and only real sense is an *internal* condition of mind and heart, not an *external* ritual or practice. Practice and profession give no proof of the actual moral status of the inner man. Thomas Jefferson, as everyone acquainted with early American history well knows, made no formal professions of religion whatever. He never even revealed his true religious beliefs and sentiments to other people, as he himself pointed out.

It is not possible, from the theosophical point of view, to be truly religious, that is to say, to be *moral* in the positive sense of the term, without knowledge—without possessing at least an intuitive perception of the divine nature of man and of the immutable law of Karma. Moral codes based upon ignorance or fear, or rooted in systems offering personal salvation as premiums to the "best behaved," can never sustain the individual in time of real trial. Mere goodness without knowledge to back it up sometimes results in tragic loss. Think of the many so-called religious people who have been known to "break" under the strain of difficulty, or who became bitter when circumstances turned against them! Few there are who possess both the moral and mental stamina necessary to sustain them through the hazards of twentieth century life. Either they ally themselves with the ever-growing army of materialists, or sink back into the apathy of blind belief—victims of sacerdotalism and priestcraft.

Knowledge of Theosophy makes man a responsible moral being—therefore a truly religious one. It enables him to stand on his own feet, without dependence upon either priest or preacher. Knowledge of Reincarnation and Karma, and of the divine nature of Soul, leads to the conviction that present trials and hardships are but the fruitage of one's own past actions, and that whatever one is called to face in the future, he possesses in himself the courage and the power to face it.

ON THE LOOKOUT

The Bible On Capitol Hill

A special dispatch for Nov. 18, 1956, from two Washington Correspondents for *Parade,* Pasadena *Independent-Star News* supplement, anticipates a struggle in Congress concerning the proposed adoption of the Ten Commandments as an official Resolution, binding the United States to Christian faith:

> Suppose the 10 Commandments were sent to Congress for legislative action. How far would Moses get on Capitol Hill?
>
> That he would encounter obstacles not mentioned in the Bible is indicated by the Senate's handling of Concurrent Resolution 88. Introduced by Sens. Styles Bridges (R., N.H.) and Earle Clements (D., Ky.) two days before Congress adjourned, it went almost unnoticed by the press. Yet it threw the Senate into a parliamentary tizzy.
>
> Resolution 88 proclaims a simple belief that "the 10 Commandments, as the primary moral force behind the three great religions of today, Christianity, Judaism and Islam, should be reaffirmed as the ethical code governing the lives of men and are the means of bringing about lasting world peace and a solution to the many problems of mankind.

The Protection of Tradition

Despite the fact that Senator Bridges introduced the Resolution as a means to "stimulate spiritual thinking," Congress refused to buy the package unopened. The *Parade* story continues:

> Why did this unpublicized resolution cause the biggest backstage stir the Senate has seen in years? The answer is found in the first clause of the first Constitutional Amendment: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion. . . ."
>
> Intended not to discourage religion but to assure equal religious freedom for all, this clause has been held by the courts to be the basis for separating Church and State. Congress, as an arm of the State, has authority to consider just about every known topic in its various committees—except strictly religious ones.
>
> Thus the parliamentarians first thought the Constitution, itself, would have to be amended before Congress could consider the resolution.

The actual discussion was soon abridged by an amusing byplay: The Senate's "chief parliamentarian," Charles Watkins, pointed out that

since the words "world" and "nations" pass beyond the scope of internal U.S. concern, Resolution 88 should be assigned to the Foreign Relations Committee. This was done, but a startled clerk from FRC immediately wanted to know, "Since when did *we* have jurisdiction over the Ten Commandments?"

The last paragraph of the *Parade* dispatch, however, will sound a little alarming to those who view sectarianism in high places with disfavor. *Parade* sums up:

> If no objections are heard from Constitutional lawyers, the committee probably will study and approve it. Then it will be sent to the Senate floor for a vote, then to the House for concurrence. Congress may yet declare formally its faith in God and the 10 Commandments.

Catholic Ban on Psychology

That modern defenders of the faith are busy on all fronts, endeavoring to make the most of a much popularized "revival" of religious intent, is evidenced by a special report published in the *Chicago Daily Tribune* (July 3, 1956). Bishop Mark K. Carroll of the diocese of southeastern Kansas made a public proclamation in which he warned of the dangers to Catholic faith encountered in modern universities. The dispatch begins:

> Roman Catholic students from the diocese of southeastern Kansas have been forbidden to enroll in most undergraduate psychology and philosophy courses offered at colleges and universities not under church control.
>
> Bishop Mark K. Carroll of the diocese has charged that many of these courses constitute "brainwashing" that endangers a student's faith in his church and loyalty to his country.
>
> In past years students in the diocese have been told to seek advice before entering such schools. There is nothing unusual in his position, the Bishop said.
>
> His directive this year was more emphatic.

Religion or Treason

According to Bishop Carroll, the defection of Korean war prisoners who adopted Communism is to be laid at the door of the "professors of psychology and philosophy" who "brainwashed" their religions away. The dispatch continues, with some further vehemence from Bishop Carroll:

> The American public at large seems to be somnolent and totally indifferent to the brainwashers at home who are deliberately, in the

name of academic freedom, destroying the potential services our educated youth must give to our country if it is to survive as a democracy.

Bishop Carroll said he had not singled out any particular course at a specific university.

He said he had seen some students who had gone away to secular colleges filled with high ideals and deep religious faith return "as thoroly brainwashed as they could be."

Religious Training Programs

An item appearing in the Pasadena *Independent Star-News* (Nov. 4, 1956) is typical of many current journalistic attempts to favor the supposedly laudable efforts of sectarian groups to "train up a child in the way he should go," according to a Christian faith. Under the Released Time Religious Section of the California Education Code, the "lending" of public-school students to religious agencies is quite "legal." But while many defenders of such religious instruction have maintained that this is simply to allow properly devout children to maintain religious contact during the week, the program actually becomes a sort of missionary crusade. The *Independent* clarifies:

According to the Rev. William C. Mays, chairman of the released time program in Monrovia which is sponsored by the Monrovia-Duarte Ministerial Assn. with the cooperation of the PTA, there is considerable "missionary value" to the program.

"Last year 30 per cent of our students had no regular connection with church or Sunday School. The 30 half-hour sessions provided by the released time plan almost equals the amount of time a child would attend Sunday School during the year," said the minister.

A survey conducted by the Department of Christian Education, Southern California Council of Protestant Churches, which clears all released time programs in the Southland, shows that more than one-fourth of all students in the classes are not in attendance at any other type of religious teaching or gathering; that between one-third and one-half are not regular attendants at Sunday School or church, and 70 per cent of the parents of those attending indicate no church affiliation.

The council holds three institutes each year to train teachers and provides curriculum suggestions to the Protestant churches. It also assigns coordinators to assist ministers and parents in obtaining meeting places, transportation and teachers.

The Unreal Revival

Time for Nov. 26 produces the result of an interesting survey—wherein church leaders frankly admit that the "revival" about which we read so much is based on a shaky foundation:

Is the U.S. religious revival "real"? What caused it? Is it "leading to the betterment of individual lives"? When the National Council of Churches' monthly *Outlook* put these questions to 34 top religious leaders and laymen, they found the laymen generally optimistic and the professionals generally skeptical. Some of the more notable head-shakings:

Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, Stated Clerk of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and president of the National Council of Churches: "The old questions 'Can I believe?' had given way to the new, 'What shall I believe in?' . . . There is a danger, however, that many may be coming into the church in search of security, survival and peace. Good as these values are, they become evil when they are . . . made into objects of man's ultimate concern."

Dr. J. W. Behnken, president of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod: "I do not believe that there are at the moment many deep religious convictions among these seekers."

Even Billy Graham

Apparently, Evangelist Graham is less smug about the current religious tempo than his middlebrow counterpart, Norman Vincent Peale. Dr. Peale feels that everything is wonderful with religion these days, but Graham remarked that while "there is no doubt that we are experiencing the great religious renaissance in American history, . . . there seems to be little evidence of increased personal morality . . . To become a church member in America is easy, too easy . . . . It must be remembered, though, that in the Wesleyan Revival of the 18th century there was a time lag of nearly a quarter of a century between the preaching . . . and the impact on the social life of Britain."

The especially frank opinion from Dr. Liston Pope, Dean of Yale Divinity School, provides a fitting conclusion:

There is no great religious revival in America, and probably will not be in the accepted sense . . . But there is a great revival of interest . . . Religion has a better hearing, and less open opposition . . . (But) the extension of church membership . . . should not be allowed to obscure the present state of the world . . . At this time of the greatest need, the influence of religion on human affairs appears to be indirect, and, all told, rather minimal.

The Buddhist Contrast

Western students of Eastern philosophy and religion, and particularly those attracted to the Buddhist tradition, continually turn up points of psychological emphasis which cause orthodox Christianity to suffer

markedly by comparison. A recent article in *Diogenes* indicates that the Buddhist regards *even his own doctrines* as but temporary and evanescent, when measured against the backdrop of eternity. The writer, George Coedes, is especially interested in the fact that Buddha himself predicted that his particular doctrinal form would disappear—probably at the end of a five-thousand-year cycle. Mr. Coedes writes:

> There is in fact an old prophecy with which all Buddhists are familiar, even though they may choose not to speak of it, according to which Sakyamuni announced that the doctrine which he preached would disappear at the end of a period which is generally fixed at 5,000 years.
>
> But, it may be said, how could the Buddha fix an end to the observance of his doctrine? On what does this tradition rest? In what measure has the doctrine exercised an influence on the history of Buddhism? How can one reconcile belief in a limited duration of the religion with the perspective, in a far-distant future, of the appearance of a Buddha who will be called Maitreya? Does not this Messianic hope imply belief in the permanence of the religion over countless millenniums?

A Different Sort of Heresy

The constancy of Buddhist philosophy and religion is observed by Mr. Coedes in the following paragraphs:

> In reality, in the realm of Buddhist philosophy it is a heresy to speak of permanence; the great law preached by Sakyamuni is the law of impermanence. Man is subject to transmigration in a cycle of innumerable rebirths. The cosmos is subject to destruction and periodic recreation. The only eternal truth is that of Nirvana, which is stability without place or shape. The religion itself, like everything else, is subject to decline and disappearance, only to be reborn in another period of the universe, through the preaching of a new Buddha.
>
> Accordingly, the tradition of an ending which Sakyamuni himself implied in his doctrine is in full harmony with this conception, and one can give some credence to the passage in the Scriptures which attributes this statement to him. The passage is part of the most ancient expression of the tradition. It was accepted by all the Schools, and therefore antedates the first schism, which took place in the middle of the fourth century B.C. and is to be found in the first of the three Canons relating to the rules of monastic discipline.

Not the End Yet

However one interprets the meaning of the "five thousand year cycle" it is difficult not to be enthused, as is Mr. Coedes, by the healthy spirit

of present Buddhist renascence—especially in India. The twenty-five hundredth anniversary of the Buddha has been a year of good omen, and it is quite apparent there is nothing yet "dated" in either Buddhist scripture or philosophy. Mr. Coedes concludes by calling attention to the nature of Buddhist "conquest":

> Thanks to the art of printing and the other means of diffusion which man today has at his command, the preservation of the Canon is assured all over the globe for a period far longer than ancient man could have thought possible, unless of course humanity is destroyed by thermonuclear suicide. If I have insisted in recalling somewhat in detail their pessimistic views about the future of their beliefs, it has been with the purpose of throwing light on the flourishing condition of Buddhism in the world after 2,500 years of its existence. It is true that Buddhism has practically disappeared from its country of origin, India, where it is scarcely represented except by the archeological remains of its ancient prosperity. On the other hand, Buddhism has made conquests or fundamentally influenced large areas of east and southeast Asia. Moreover, it has commanded attention in Europe as well as in America as one of the great universal religions whose dynamism it would be wrong to underestimate. In India itself, where it was rejected, Buddhism begins to be recognized once again for the part it played in the teaching of Sakyamuni, which occupies such a prominent place in Indian thought.

REINCARNATION—"UNITY" VERSION

Along with the popular winds of opinion generally favorable to reincarnation, some unorthodox Christian divines are devoting concentrated attention to both reincarnation and karma. Ernest C. Wilson, minister of the Christ Church, Unity, in Los Angeles, for example, has recently published a volume entitled *Have You Lived Other Lives?* This book seems truer to the theosophic idea of reincarnation than the versions of Emmet Fox—a rather careless borrower from theosophic sources. (See THEOSOPHY 40:239.)

Mr. Wilson's introduction reads, in part:

> There are things I have always seemed to know, ready and waiting only for recognition in my mind, more often recognized by feeling than by thought; things that seem to belong to me, and others that I must work hard and strive for, only to wonder why I have striven, for they are no part of me, and cannot be made to seem so. I have longed —and still am longing—to rend the veil of partition that hides what we do not know from what we think we do. Or if rend is too strong a word, at least to peek through.

Why should some of us be born into the world handicapped, others with well bodies; some mentally dull, others with such endowments that they become prodigies, geniuses? Does heredity offer explanations? Yes, but not completely.

Why, in a world so filled with wonders and with woe, with heights to climb, things to do, places to see, should our tenure of life be so brief? Why should the cry so often be heard on human lips, "What have I done that this should come upon me?" There is much to justify our misfortunes, if all were known, by errors of human ignorance and frailty; but still that much does not seem to be enough. This is what started me, long ago, [searching] for other answers. I believe I have found some of them—at least by intimation.

Psychology a Meeting Point

Dr. Wilson is frank to admit, as was Edgar Cayce, that his first contact with the idea of reincarnation was troubling. His reversal of attitude "evolved from a bereavement," and gradually he began to find himself entirely in tune with the idea. His reasoning seems exceedingly well balanced. A sample:

If life is a continuum, then what we see as a lifetime is only a segment of that continuum, veiled from our senses by their apparent limitations. If this life is only a segment of eternal life, what is beyond the segment?

Shall we live again?

Have we lived before?

Almost all religious faith postulates a future life. Most of the major religious faiths include theories of past life, or past lives. This idea may meet with resistance in our minds because it is strange to the religious ideology in which we have been reared. Most of us do not even think of such things until something peculiar to our personal life gives rise to it.

Why should we go into such considerations at all? For the same reason that we have investigated and tried to understand the nature of the earth, the universe, the total creation of which we are a part. Science has learned a great deal about the outer world, and is more concerned with processes than it is with beginnings and ultimates. Religion is concerned with processes, but it is also concerned with beginnings and ultimates. It is primarily concerned with the "inner" world, just as science is concerned with the outer world.

Science has devoted most of its attention to the world around us, and has only recently begun to study systematically the more immediate environment of man—what we call the world within us, the world of thoughts, feelings, attitudes. Psychology affords a kind of meeting

> point between the consideration of the inner world and the outer world, between religion and science.

Dr. Wilson elsewhere expresses the view that reincarnation philosophy can become and should become relevant to a new psychological language, eventually to be spoken between religion and science—and hopes that psychologists will more rapidly acquire a broader orientation so that this may come about the sooner.

God Will Not Give Up

Dr. Wilson is not quite prepared to desert the idea of a personal God, however, though many of his passages indicate he inclines to an impersonal definition of deity. Perhaps he feels that, whatever his own personal views, the "God" symbol is still of importance to many. Thus we encounter abrupt switches from the self-reliant sort of philosophizing already quoted to such passages as the following:

> We die to the body of infancy in order that we may be born to that of childhood. We die to the body of childhood that we may be born to youth, and from youth to maturity. It has not harmed us, but may rather have greatly helped us, for quite obviously God did not wish us to live always in the body of infancy, or childhood, or youth, or even maturity. Otherwise He would have made different provisions for us.
>
> The body is not the person. It is merely our cloak of visibility, our means of contact with this plane of life, so that we may experience its challenges, its lessons, its opportunities, and grow in grace and wisdom, and understanding of the power of God's spirit in the inward man—the soul.

Cycles the Way We Want Them

Dr. Wilson is reminiscent of the aforementioned Emmet Fox in his penchant for presenting reincarnation in its most personally appealing guise. For example—and without mentioning sources from which he derives his authority—he remarks that "the cycle of soul life between incarnations is estimated as being anywhere from a hundred to a thousand years; shorter when the previous earth life has been characterized by unfinished projects which the soul is eager to re-initiate; longer when the life has been rich and complete, and rest and refreshment are indicated. However, time as we conceive it has no relevant meaning to the soul. To soul sense we live most truly 'in thoughts and feelings, not in figures on a dial'." In other words, the reader is apt to imagine that the

interim periods between his own lives on earth will be just the way he wants them to be; those who like to think of their lives as being "rich and complete," and who also like the idea of "rest and refreshment," are able to be pleased, as well as those who consider themselves fortunate in possessing the energy to initiate and continue numberless "projects." God also enters the picture here, although with reservations:

> In the degree that we suffer in the process, it is not by God's decree but by our own. We suffer because the law of goodness is irreversible. Suffering is a check on disobedience by which the law of progressive goodness would be reversed. A child who is teething bites his fingers. If he bites too hard, the resultant pain is not a punishment, but a protection. It is as if God were saying: "Not too hard, my child. You will have a better use for those fingers later on. They are not intended as a teething ring."

Point—Counterpoint

The concluding passages of *Have You Lived Other Lives?* illustrate Dr. Wilson's two types of psychological emphasis—the philosophical and the somewhat sentimentally religious:

> I believe in reincarnation because something within me tells me that it is true.
>
> I believe in it because I seem to remember that I have lived before.
>
> I believe in it because of a number of experiences that I have had that I can explain in no other way.
>
> I believe in it because of its logic. I cannot believe that this little span of life is all that God intends us to have.
>
> I believe in reincarnation because there are certain situations that I seem to have met before and to recognize now as I approach them, even before I experience them.
>
> I believe in it because every once in a while I find something in my intercourse with people that is like the renewal of old contacts, the resumption of old friendships.
>
> I believe in it because it does not contradict any other conviction that I have about life.
>
> I believe in it as the hidden doctrine in the Holy Scriptures, and on the evidence of its helpfulness I find that it exerts in the lives of persons I know, and in my own life.

God, Again

> I believe in it, frankly, too, because I hope that it is true. I want to believe that God gives us another chance, many more chances if need be, to embody the ideal He has for me. The way I feel about this is as if I had worn out a precious garment and laid it aside and He should

> say: "Here, My child, I will give you a fresh new garment. You have another day, another opportunity. Go out from your Father's house into the world of sense and do your best and be worthy of your sonship to Me. I will be with you, I shall not forsake you, and I will help you to express what in My heart I have always seen you to be. You shall declare in the world the glory that in the beginning you had with Me before the world was."

This honest and in many ways thoughtful work is bound to have value. *Have You Lived Other Lives?* may be the means for introducing many having no contact with Theosophy to impersonal philosophizing. However, much of the book is devoted to extraordinary instances of clairvoyance, clairaudience and other forms of extra-sensory perception. So, as with the much publicized case of Bridey Murphy, the phenomenal aspects of "realms beyond the senses" receive more than their balanced due of attention.

Home Remedy Substitutes for Blood Plasma

Time, Aug. 20, announces that a team of U.S. Public Health Service scientists has found a simple substitute for the customary intravenous injections of whole blood or plasma in treating "shock" after extensive burns (more than ten per cent of the skin). Search for a substitute was advisable since plasma is often either not available or contains hepatitis virus. The simple remedy discovered is a solution of table salt and baking soda, taken orally. *Time* continues:

> Although salt and baking soda has been a remedy for burns for many years, nobody had suggested that it could be substituted for plasma injections. The present findings are based on a four-year study of burn victims conducted by U.S. and Peruvian researchers in Lima. If administered within three hours after injury, the scientists found, the saline solution (two teaspoons of table salt to one of baking soda in two quarts of water) acts just as effectively as plasma in warding off shock. The victim may drink as many as seven quarts of the solution in the first twelve hours. Later, the patient gets standard hospital burn treatment.

This mild, natural technique has the further advantage, from a theosophic viewpoint, of not interfering with the individual's *own* psychochemical organization.

THE UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS

DECLARATION

The policy of this Lodge is independent devotion to the cause of Theosophy, without professing attachment to any Theosophical organization. It is loyal to the great Founders of the Theosophical Movement, but does not concern itself with dissensions or differences of individual opinion.

The work it has on hand and the end it keeps in view are too absorbing and too lofty to leave it the time or inclination to take part in side issues. That work and that end is the dissemination of the Fundamental Principles of the philosophy of Theosophy, and the exemplification in practice of those principles, through a truer realization of the SELF; a profounder conviction of Universal Brotherhood.

It holds that the unassailable basis for union among Theosophists, wherever and however situated, is "similarity of aim, purpose and teaching," and therefore has neither Constitution, By-Laws nor Officers, the sole bond between its Associates being that basis. And it aims to disseminate this idea among Theosophists in the furtherance of Unity.

It regards as Theosophists all who are engaged in the true service of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, condition or organization, and

It welcomes to its association all those who are in accord with its declared purposes and who desire to fit themselves, by study and otherwise, to be the better able to help and teach others.

"The true Theosophist belongs to no cult or sect; yet belongs to each and all."

Being in sympathy with the purposes of this Lodge, as set forth in its "Declaration," I hereby record my desire to be enrolled as an Associate, it being understood that such association calls for no obligation on my part, other than that which I, myself, determine.

The foregoing is the form signed by Associates of the United Lodge of Theosophists. Inquiries are invited from all persons to whom this Movement may appeal. Cards for signatures will be sent upon request, and every possible assistance furnished Associates in their studies and in efforts to form local Lodges. There are no fees of any kind, and no formalities to be complied with. Write to:

GENERAL REGISTRAR, UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS,
Theosophy Hall, 33rd and Grand Ave., Los Angeles 7, Calif.

U. L. T. LODGES

AMSTERDAM, Z. HOLLAND ..... 123 Stadionweg
BANGALORE CITY, INDIA ..... 15 Sir Krishna Rao Rd., Basavangudi
BERCHEM, ANTWERP, BELGIUM ..... 62 Transvaal Straat
BERKELEY 4, CALIFORNIA ..... Masonic Temple Bldg., Bancroft and Shattuck
BOMBAY 1, INDIA ..... 51 Mahatma Gandhi Road
LAGUNA BEACH, CALIFORNIA ..... 1175 South Coast Boulevard
LEIDEN, HOLLAND ..... Roodenburgerstraat 35
LONDON W. 2, ENGLAND ..... 62 Queen's Gardens
LONDON, ONTARIO, CANADA ..... 524 William Street
LOS ANGELES 7, CALIFORNIA ..... 245 West 33rd Street
MATUNGA, BOMBAY 19, INDIA ..... Anandi Nivas, Bhaudaji Road
NEW YORK 21, NEW YORK ..... 347 East 72nd Street
PARIS 16, FRANCE ..... 11 bis rue Keppler
PHILADELPHIA 3, PENNSYLVANIA ..... 1917 Walnut Street
PHOENIX, ARIZONA ..... 32 North Central Avenue
READING, PENNSYLVANIA ..... 812 North Fifth Street
SACRAMENTO 14, CALIFORNIA ..... 1237½ H Street
SAN DIEGO 3, CALIFORNIA ..... 3148 Fifth Avenue
SAN FRANCISCO 14, CALIFORNIA ..... 166 Sanchez Street
SAN LEANDRO, CALIFORNIA ..... 579 Foothill Boulevard
SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA ..... Federation House, 166 Phillip Street
WASHINGTON 9, D. C. ..... 1722 Connecticut Ave., N.W.

THEOSOPHICAL PUBLICATIONS

Books by H. P. Blavatsky:

ISIS UNVEILED, a photographic facsimile of the Original Edition, the two volumes bound in one	$ 7.50
THE SECRET DOCTRINE, facsimile edition, two volumes in one	8.50
INDEX TO THE SECRET DOCTRINE, for students	3.00
THE SECRET DOCTRINE *and* INDEX	11.00
THE KEY TO THEOSOPHY, facsimile of Original Edition	3.00
THEOSOPHICAL GLOSSARY. facsimile of Original Edition	5.00
TRANSACTIONS OF THE BLAVATSKY LODGE	2.50
THE VOICE OF THE SILENCE	1.50

Books by William Q. Judge:

THE OCEAN OF THEOSOPHY	2.00
LETTERS THAT HAVE HELPED ME, new and enlarged edition	3.00
THE BHAGAVAD-GITA	1.50
NOTES ON THE BHAGAVAD-GITA	2.50
PATANJALI'S YOGA APHORISMS	1.50
THE HEART DOCTRINE, selections from Wm. Q. Judge	2.00
VERNAL BLOOMS, selected articles from W.Q.J.	2.00

Other Books:

THE FRIENDLY PHILOSOPHER, Letters and Talks by Robert Crosbie	3.00
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON THE "OCEAN," by Robert Crosbie	2.00
THE ETERNAL VERITIES, for children, new edition	2.00
TEACHER'S MANUAL AND GUIDE TO THE "ETERNAL VERITIES"	2.50
"BECAUSE—" FOR THE CHILDREN WHO ASK WHY	2.00
LIGHT ON THE PATH, written down by "M.C." (Bombay Ed.)	.75
THROUGH THE GATES OF GOLD, written down by "M.C."	1.50
OCCULT TALES, by H. P. Blavatsky and Wm. Q. Judge	2.00
FROM THE BOOK OF IMAGES, a volume of Indian tales	3.00
THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, 1875-1950	5.00
SELECTIONS FROM THE UPANISHADS, AND THE TAO TE KING	2.00
THE DHAMMAPADA	2.00

Pamphlets:

THEOSOPHY SIMPLY STATED (10 copies, 50 cents; 50 copies, $2.00)	.10
CONVERSATIONS ON THEOSOPHY, including the "Three Fundamentals"	.10
REINCARNATION AND KARMA, the "Aphorisms," by Wm. Q. Judge	.10
THOUGHTS FOR THINKERS, a helpful essay	.10
WHAT IS DEATH?	.10
THE VOCATION OF LIFE	.10
THE UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS, its history, purpose, and methods	.25
FIVE MESSAGES TO AMERICAN THEOSOPHISTS, by H. P. Blavatsky	.25
EPITOME OF THEOSOPHY, by William Q. Judge	.25
ECHOES FROM THE ORIENT, by William Q. Judge	.50
MORAL EDUCATION, new and enlarged edition	.50
A CHRISTIAN AND A THEOSOPHIST	.25
THE LAWS OF HEALING, Physical and Metaphysical	.50
STATES AFTER DEATH, and Spiritualistic "Communications" Explained	.35
CYCLES OF PSYCHISM, The Import of Psychic Evolution	.50
HYPNOTISM—A PSYCHIC MALPRACTICE	.25
WHAT IS THEOSOPHY? A collation from H. P. Blavatsky	.25

Prices subject to change without notice. Order from

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY

245 West 33rd Street, Los Angeles 7, California
347 East 72nd Street, New York 21, New York